NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

THE

HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

VOLUME IV.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

THE HISTORY

OF

MODERN EUROPE

FROM THE FALL OF CONSTANTINOPLE IN 1453 TO THE CLOSE OF THE CRIMEAN WAR IN 1857

36962
ac

BY THOMAS HENRY DYER

IN FOUR VOLUMES—VOL. IV.

LONDON
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET
1864

The right of translation is reserved

00036962

A

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF

THE FOURTH VOLUME.

BOOK VII.

FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION IN 1789, TO THE FALL OF NAPOLEON I. IN 1815.

CHAPTER I.

A View of the Causes, Character, and Effects of the French Revolution (pp. 3—43).

	Page
Character of the French Revolution	3
The French Nobles	4
Policy of Richelieu	5
Feudal Privileges	6
Class Hatreds	7
State of the Church	8
Despotism of the Crown	9
State of the Provinces	10
Pays d'Élection and *Pays d'État*	—
Inequality of Taxation	11
Centralisation	12
Physiocrats	13
Economists	14
The New Philosophy	15
Infidelity	16
French Writers who influenced the Revolution	17
Montesquieu	—
Voltaire	18
His English Studies	19
State of the French Church	20
Character of Voltaire's Works	21
The Encyclopædists	22
J. J. Rousseau	23
His Views of Society	24
Question of his Sincerity	25
Doctrine of Sovereignty of the People	26
His Idea of Civil Freedom	27
His Notion of Equality	28
An Advocate of Aristocracy	29
Difference between Sensibility and Goodness	30
Effects of the Censorship examined	31
Degradation of the Monarchy	32
Effect of the American Revolution	33
Of the Deficit	34
Importance of the Doubling of the *Tiers État*	35
Necker's Conduct examined	36
Mistakes of the Court	37
Effects of Centralisation	—
Sovereignty of the Paris Mob	38
Character of the Deputies	39
Literary Influences	40
Extenuating Circumstances	—
A Comparison of the French and English Revolutions	41
Different Character of Charles I. and Louis XIV.	42
Effects of the French Revolution	43

CHAPTER II.

Progress of the Revolution from the Royal Session in 1789 *till the Flight to Varennes in* 1791 (pp. 44—77).

A.D.		Page
1789.	Proceedings of the National Assembly	44
	Royal Session	—
	Oath in the Tennis Court	45
	The King annuls the Proceedings of the Assembly	—
	Union of the Three Orders	46
	State of the Army	47
	State of Paris	48
	The National Guard instituted	49
	Insurrection	—
	Capture of the Bastille	50
	Louis visits Paris	51
	The Emigration begins	52
	Massacres at the *Lanterne* and other Places	53
	Return of Necker	—
	The Constituent Assembly	54
	The Duke of Orleans	—
	Robespierre	55
	Count de Mirabeau	—
	Debates of the Assembly	56
	Renunciation of Privileges	57
	Question of the *Veto*	58
	Plot to seize the King	59
	Banquet at Versailles	60
	The Mob at Versailles	61
1789.	Storming of the Palace	62
	The Royal Family brought to Paris	63
	The Jacobin Club	64
	The Journals	65
	Marat	66
	Patriotic Contributions	67
	Abolition of Tithes	—
1790.	Origin of *Assignats*	68
	Confiscation of Church Property	—
	Sections of Paris	69
	Mirabeau sells himself to the Court	70
	Federative Fête—Embassy of the Human Race	—
	Retirement of Necker	71
	Civil Constitution of the Clergy	72
1791.	Death of Mirabeau	—
	Hopes of Foreign Intervention	73
	Conference at Mantua	74
	Louis compelled to approve the Revolution	75
	Flight of the Royal Family to Varennes	76
	The King suspended	77
	Letter of De Bouillé to the Assembly	—

CHAPTER III.

Progress of the Revolution from the Flight to Varennes till the Insurrection of August 10*th* (pp. 78—103).

1791.	Appearance of a Republican Party	78
	The *Cordeliers* and *Feuillants*	—
	Jacobin Petition	79
	Remonstrances of Foreign Powers	—
	Zeal of Frederick William II. and Gustavus III.	80
	Declaration of Pilnitz	81
	Act of the Constitution	—
	Close of the Constituent Assembly	82
	Annexation of Avignon	—
	Self-denying Ordinance	83
	Louis accepts the Constitution	—
	The Legislative Assembly	84
	Decrees against the Emigrants	85
	The French prepare for War	86
1792.	Dumouriez Foreign Minister	87
	Roland and his Wife	—
	Views of Russia and the German Sovereigns	88
	Louis declares War against Francis I.	89
1792.	First Hostilities: Flight of the French	89
	Indiscreet Letter of Lafayette	90
	Struggle between the Girondists and Jacobins	91
	Insurrection of June 20th	92
	Louis treats with the Coalition	93
	The Marseillese	94
	Fête of the Federation	95
	Advance of the Allies	96
	Insurrectionary Preparations	97
	Manifesto of the Duke of Brunswick	98
	The King's Abdication demanded	99
	Preparations to defend the Tuileries	100
	Insurrection of August 10th	—
	Murder of Mandat	101
	The King takes Refuge in the Assembly	102
	Capture of the Tuileries	103

CHAPTER IV.

Progress of the Revolution from the Insurrection of August 10th to the Execution of Louis XVI., and Declaration of War against England (pp. 104—131).

A.D.		Page
1792.	The Girondists in Power: Danton	104
	The Muncipality	105
	The Royal Family at the Temple	—
	Extraordinary Criminal Tribunal	—
	Proceedings of the *Commune*	106
	Domiciliary Visits	107
	Massacres of September	108
	Question of Premeditation	110
	Principal Instigators	111
	Campaign on the Frontiers	112
	Battle of Valmy	—
	The National Convention	113
	Royalty abolished	114
	Marat in the Assembly	115
	Battle of Jemappes	116
	The French overrun Belgium	117
1792.	Royal Life in the Temple	118
	Louis XVI. arraigned before the Convention	119
	Appeal to the People rejected	120
1793.	The King condemned	121
	Executed	122
	Opinion of Europe	123
	Insolent Pretensions of the Convention	124
	Revolutionary Clubs in England	125
	England prepares for War	126
	Conduct of the Government examined	127
	The Convention declares War	128
	Treaties concluded by England	129
	Charles IV. of Spain and his Minister Godoy	130

CHAPTER V.

Progress of the Revolution from the Execution of Louis XVI. till the Execution of Robespierre, July 28th, 1794 (pp. 132—179).

1793.	Anarchy in France	132
	Insurrection in La Vendée	—
	The Revolutionary Tribunal	133
	Campaign of Dumouriez	134
	He threatens the Convention	—
	Arrests the Jacobin Commissaries	135
	Compelled to fly	—
	Committees of Public Welfare and General Safety	136
	The Gironde and the Mountain	137
	Trial of Marat	138
	Commission of Twelve	139
	The Central Club	140
	The Convention overawed	141
	Arrest of the Girondists	142
	Marat assassinated	143
	Blasphemous Honours paid to him	144
	Constitution of *An* I.	—
	Campaign on the Frontiers	145
	Execution of Custine	146
	Robespierre enters the Committee of Public Welfare	147
	Proceedings of the Committee	148
	Fête of the Constitution	—
	The Criminal Tribunal reformed	149
	The Reign of Terror inaugurated	150
1793.	The *Loi des Suspects*	150
	Marie Antoinette arraigned	151
	Executed	152
	The Girondists guillotined	—
	Republican Calendar	153
	Worship of Reason	154
	Opposed by Robespierre	155
	Insurrection in La Vendée	156
	Admiral Hood at Toulon	—
	Reduction of Lyon	157
	Of Toulon	158
	Atrocities at Bordeaux, Marseilles, &c.	—
	Carrier at Nantes	159
	Siege of Dunkirk	160
	Battle of Wattignies	161
	Disputes between Austria and Prussia	162
	St. Just at Strasburg	163
	Campaign in Spain and Italy	164
	French Republican Factions	—
	Robespierre and Camille Desmoulins	165
1794.	The Hébertistes exterminated	166
	Execution of Danton and others	167
	Robespierre's Fête of the Supreme Being	168
	Law of 22nd *Prairial*	169

A.D.		Page
1794.	Robespierre absents himself from the Committee	170
	The *Chemises Rouges*	171
	Plot against Robespierre	172
	Catherine Théot	—
	The 9th *Thermidor*	173
1794.	Robespierre and others arrested	174
	Scene at the *Hôtel de Ville*	175
	Execution of Robespierre	176
	His Character	177
	Close of the Reign of Terror	178
	Its Character	—

CHAPTER VI.

General Affairs of Europe.—Insurrection in Poland and Second and Third Partitions of that Country.—Death of Catherine II. of Russia and Accession of Peter III.—View of the Scandinavian Kingdoms—Of Germany, Naples, the Papal States, and Venice (pp. 180—208).

1787.	Insurrection in Poland	180
1789.	Permanent Council abolished	181
1790.	Defensive Alliance with Prussia	182
1791.	New Polish Constitution	183
	Machinations of Catherine II.	184
1792.	Confederation of Targowitz	185
	Thaddeus Kosciuszko	186
1793.	Treaty between Russia and Prussia for the Partition of Poland	187
	Diet of Grodno	188
	Second Partition of Poland	189
1794.	Fresh Insurrection	190
	Kosciuszko Generalissimo	—
	National Council	191
	Warsaw besieged by Frederick William II.	192
	Prussian Tyranny in Poland	193
	Siege of Warsaw raised	—
	Kosciuszko defeated by the Russians at Maciewice	194
	Finis Poloniæ	—
	Third Partition of Poland	195
1795.	Stanislaus resigns the Crown	196
1796.	Death of Catherine II.	—
	Paul I. Petrowitsch	197
	Scene at the Tomb of Peter III.	—
	View of Scandinavia	198
	Administration of Frederick VI. as Prince Royal	—
	Zeal of Gustavus III. of Sweden against the French Revolution	—
	His Alliance with Catherine II. (1791)	199
	He is assassinated (1792)	200
	Accession of Gustavus IV.	—
	State of Germany	201
	The *Illuminati*	202
	Account of Baron Thugut	203
	Haugwitz and Hardenberg	204
	Naples under Ferdinand IV.	205
	His Minister Tanucci	206
	Pope Pius VI.	207
	Account of Venice	208

CHAPTER VII.

State of France.—Reaction.—Overthrow of the Jacobins.—Campaigns of 1794 *and* 1795.*—End of the Convention and Establishment of the Directory* (pp. 210—237).

1794.	The *Parti Thermidorien*	210
	La Jeunesse Dorée	—
	The Jacobin Club closed	211
1795.	Last Insurrection	212
	The *Terreur Blanche*	213
	Campaign of 1794	214
	Plans of Mack	215
	Decree of No Quarter	216
	Battle of Fleurus	217
	Prussian Treachery	218
	The Duke of York retreats	219
	The French occupy Holland	220
	The Batavian Republic established	—
	Treaty of Basle between France and Prussia	221
	Results of Prussian Policy	222
	Spanish and Italian Campaigns	223
1795.	Corsica revolts from France	224
	Lord Howe's Victory, 1793	—
	Negociations	225
	Death of Louis XVII.	226
	Peace of Basle between France and Spain	227
	Godoy, 'Prince of the Peace'	—
	Insurrection in La Vendée	—
	New French Constitution	228
	Councils of Five Hundred and Ancients	—
	The Directory	229
	Insurrection of 13 *Vendémiaire*	230
	General Bonaparte	—
	The Five Directors	231
	The Convention dissolved	232
	State of France after the Revolution	233
	Campaign	234

A.D. Page
1795. Plans of Pichegru 235
Abortive Negociations between England and France . . 236
A.D. Page
1795. The Revolution becomes a Military *Propaganda* . . 237

CHAPTER VIII.

Napoleon Bonaparte's Italian Campaign.—Campaign of Moreau in Germany.—Bonaparte and Pius VI.—Peace of Tolentino.—Preliminaries of Leoben.—Fall of Venice.—Ligurian and Cisalpine Republics.—18th Fructidor.—Peace of Campo Formio (pp. 238—281).

1796. French Plan of a Campaign against the Emperor . . 238
Napoleon Bonaparte commands the Army of Italy 239
Battles of Montenotte, &c. . 240
Victor Amadeus III. proposes Peace 241
His Death, and Accession of Charles Emanuel IV. . . 242
Bonaparte at Milan . . . 243
His Exactions 244
Ferdinand IV. of Naples secures his Neutrality . . 245
The Pope coerced 246
Leghorn seized—Genoa threatened 247
Campaign on the Rhine . . 248
The Prussian Cabinet courts the French Invaders of Germany 249
Seeks Aggrandisement at the Expense of the Empire . 250
Progress of the Campaign in Germany 251
Famous Retreat of Moreau . 252
The Campaign in Italy . . 253
Wurmser being defeated throws himself into Mantua . . 254
1797. Surrender of that Fortress. . 255
Treaty of S. Ildefonso between France and Spain (1796) 256
1797. Babœuf's Conspiracy . . . 257
Negociations of Lord Malmesbury 258
Bad Faith of the Directory . 259
Bonaparte and Pius VI. . . 260
Peace of Tolentino 261
Defeat of the Archduke Charles 262
Bonaparte in the Noric Alps 263
Proposes Peace . . . . . —
Preliminaries of Leoben . . 264
Campaign in Germany . . . 265
The Italians rise against the French . . . . . —
Bonaparte threatens Venice . 266
Submission of the Venetians 267
Treaty of Milan 268
Fall of Venice 269
Ligurian and Cisalpine Republics 270
Schism in the Directory . . 271
Reactionary Movements . . 272
Bonaparte and the Directory . 273
Coup d'Etat of 18th *Fructidor* 274
Proscriptions 275
Moderation of Bonaparte . 276
Negociations at Udine . . 277
Bonaparte and Cobentzl . . 278
Peace of Campo Formio . . 279
Results of the War . . . 280
The Revolution and its Master 281

CHAPTER IX.

Projected Invasion of England.—The French at Rome.—Intervention in Switzerland.—Lemanic Republic.—Helvetic Republic.—French Designs on Egypt.—Seizure of Malta.—Battles of the Pyramids and the Nile.—Parthenopean and Batavian Republics.—War renewed between Austria and France.—Suvaroff in Switzerland.—Expedition to the Helder, &c. (pp. 282—327).

1797. Death of Frederick Wm. II. of Prussia and Accession of Frederick Wm. III. . . 282
Lord Malmesbury's fruitless Negociations 283
Projects against England . 284
Bonaparte at Rastadt . . . 285
Reception at Paris 286
Declines the Invasion of England 287
1797. Quarrel with the Pope . . 288
1798. The French enter Rome . . 289
Misfortunes of Pius VI. . . 290
Pillage of Rome 291
State of Switzerland . . . 292
French Intervention and Intrigues 293
Lemanic Republic 294
Helvetic Republic 295
Subjection of Switzerland . 296

A.D.		Page
1798.	Bonaparte at Rastadt	297
	Dispute between France and America	298
	The Directory and Godoy	299
	French Designs on Egypt	300
	Military Preparations	301
	Squabble with Austria	302
	Bonaparte seizes Malta	303
	Battle of the Pyramids	304
	Battle of the Nile	—
	French Attempt on Ireland	305
	Paul I. opposes the Directory	306
	Congress at Rastadt	307
	Austro-Russian Alliance	308
	Paul I. and the Knights of St. John	309
	Russo-Turkish Alliance	310
	Naples under Ferdinand IV.	311
	Nelson at Naples	312
	The Neapolitans occupy Rome	319
	Defeat of General Mack	314
1790.	The French advance on Naples	314
1799.	Parthenopean Republic	315
	Batavian Republic (1798)	316
	War renewed between France and Austria	317
	Campaign; Battle of Stockach	318
	Murder of the French Plenipotentiaries at Rastadt	319
	Battle of Magnano	320
	Advance of Suvaroff	321
	Battle of the Trebbia	322
	The Russians in Switzerland	323
	Retreat of Suvaroff	324
	Return of Ferdinand IV.	325
	Rome recovered from the French	326
	Anglo-Russian Expedition to the Helder	—
	Paul I. abandons the Coalition	327

CHAPTER X.

French Expedition to Egypt.—Revolution of 18th Brumaire.—Bonaparte, First Consul.—Peace of Lunéville.—Armed Neutrality revived.—Copenhagen bombarded.—Peace of Amiens (pp. 328—358).

1798.	The French in Egypt	328
1799.	Bonaparte's Syrian Expedition	—
	Siege of St. John d'Acre	329
	Bonaparte returns to France	330
	Plots of Sieyès	331
	18th *Brumaire*	332
	The Five Hundred dispersed	333
	Bonaparte, First Consul	334
	Reactionary Government	335
	Bonaparte writes to George III.	336
1800.	Campaign in Italy	—
	Battle of Marengo	337
	Campaign in Germany	338
	Battle of Hohenlinden	339
1801.	Peace of Lunéville	340
	Kingdom of Etruria	341
	Concordat with Pius VII.	342
	Treaty between France and Portugal	343
1801.	Armed Neutrality revived	344
	Danish and Swedish Views	345
	French Maritime Regulations	346
	Declaration of Paul I.	347
	Principles of the Armed Neutrality	348
	Nelson at Copenhagen	349
	Murder of Paul I.	350
	Accession of Alexander I.	351
	End of the Northern War	—
	Treaties between France and Russia	352
	Sequel of the French Invasion of Egypt	—
	Convention of El Arisch (1800)	353
	Abercrombie at Aboukir	354
	Negociations	355
1802.	Peace of Amiens	356
	Article about Malta	357
	Bonaparte, Consul for Life	358

CHAPTER XI.

Progress of Despotism in France.—Napoleon, Emperor.—Indemnification of German Princes.—Act of Mediation in Switzerland.—Rupture between England and France and Spain.—The Empire of Austria.—Napoleon, King of Italy.—The Third Coalition (pp. 359—392).

1802.	Progress towards Despotism in France	359
	Legion of Honour	—
	Re-establishment of the Gallican Church	360
1802.	Reduction of St. Domingo	361
	Indemnification of German Princes	362
	Intervention of France and Russia	363

A.D.		Page
1802.	French and Russian Scheme	364
	Territorial Partitions	365
	Disturbances in Switzerland	366
	Aloys Reding	367
1803.	French "Act of Mediation"	—
	Piedmont annexed to France (1802)	368
	Ill-feeling between France and England	369
	Sebastiani's *Report*	370
	Mutual Accusations	371
	Rupture between France and England	372
	The *Détenus* of Verdun	373
	The French seize Hanover	374
	Convention between France and Spain	375
	Threatened Invasion of England	376
1804.	Abortive Conspiracy against Bonaparte	377
1804.	Murder of the Duke d'Enghien	378
	Napoleon becomes Emperor	379
	Settlement of the Empire	380
	Napoleon crowned by the Pope	381
	Breach between Russia and France	382
	Francis II. becomes Hereditary Emperor of Austria	383
	Breach between England and Spain	384
	Maritime War	385
	Russo-Austrian Alliance	386
1805.	Pitt oraganises the Third Coalition	387
	Anglo-Russian Alliance	388
	Fatal Policy of Prussia	389
	Napoleon assumes the Lombard Crown	390
	Oppressive Rule in Italy	391
	Third Coalition completed	392

CHAPTER XII.

Napoleon overthrows Austria and Prussia.—Makes his Brother Joseph King of Naples, his Brother Louis King of Holland.—Establishes the Confederation of the Rhine, extinguishes the German Empire.—Bavaria and Würtemberg erected into Kingdoms (pp. 393—428).

1805.	Napoleon moves the Army of England towards the Rhine	393
	Vacillation of Frederick William III.	—
	Preparations of the Coalition	394
	Dilatoriness of Austria	395
	Flight of the Bavarian Elector	396
	Advance of the French	397
	Mack outmanœuvred	398
	Capitulation of Ulm	399
	The French enter Vienna	400
	Italian Campaign	401
	Battle of Caldiero	—
	Negociations between Alexander I. and Frederick William III.	402
	Scene at the Tomb of Frederick II.	403
	Battle of Austerlitz	404
	The Bivouac of Saroschütz	405
	Peace of Presburg	406
	Würtemberg and Bavaria made Kingdoms	407
	Battle of Trafalgar	408
	Death of Nelson	—
1806.	Death of Pitt	—
	Humiliating Negociations of Prussia	409
	The Prussians seize Hanover	410
	The French enter Naples	411
	Joseph Bonaparte King of the Two Sicilies	412
1806.	Napoleon revives Feudalism	413
	Louis Bonaparte King of Holland	414
	The Confederation of the Rhine	415
	Mediatised Princes	416
	Extinction of the German Empire	417
	Francis II. assumes the Title of Francis I., Emperor of Austria	—
	Napoleon's Tyranny in Germany	418
	Palm, the Bookseller, shot	—
	Plan of the Northern Confederation under Prussia	419
	French Insults to Prussia	420
	Frederick William III.'s tardy Resolve on War	421
	Prussian Ultimatum	422
	Advance of the French	423
	Battles of Jena and Auerstädt	424
	Napoleon at Potsdam	425
	Death of the Duke of Brunswick	426
	Reduction of Prussian Fortresses	427
	Flight of Frederick William III.	—
	Napoleon incites a Polish Insurrection	428

CHAPTER XIII.

War between France and Russia.—Peace of Tilsit.—The Continental System.—View of the Affairs of Russia, Turkey, Sweden, Portugal, and Rome (pp. 429—458).

A.D.		Page
1806.	Napoleon makes Saxony a Kingdom	429
1807.	Advance of the Russians: Battle of Eylau	—
	Battle of Friedland	430
	Napoleon and Alexander at Tilsit	431
	Peace at Tilsit	432
	Humiliating Conditions imposed on Prussia	433
	Secret Articles of Tilsit	434
	Domination of Napoleon	435
	The Continental System	436
	Berlin Decree (1806)	—
	Milan Decree (1807)	437
	Rupture between England and Denmark	438
	Seizure of the Danish Fleet	439
	Alliance of Denmark and France	440
	Of England and Sweden	441
	Rupture between England and Russia	442
	England deserted by Austria	443
	Russian and Turkish War	444
1807.	War between England and Turkey	445
	Armistice of Slobosia	446
	War between Russia and Sweden	447
1808.	Armistice of Olkioki	448
1809.	Abdication of Gustavus IV. of Sweden	449
	Accession of Charles XIII.	—
1810.	Peace between France and Sweden	450
	Relations between France and Spain	451
1807.	Portugal coerced by France	452
	Treaties for dividing Portugal	453
	Junot at Lisbon	454
	The King of Portugal sails for Brazil	455
	Disputes between Napoleon and Pope Pius VII.	456
1808.	The French enter Rome	457
	Pius threatens Napoleon with Excommunication	—
	Napoleon annexes several Papal Provinces	458

CHAPTER XIV.

Napoleon's Intrigues to obtain Spain.—Joseph Bonaparte, King of Spain.—The British in the Peninsula.—Retreat of Sir John Moore.—War between France and Austria.—Vienna occupied by the French.—Peace of Schönbrunn (pp. 455—487).

	Retrospect of Spanish History	459
	Court Factions; Ferdinand and Godoy	—
1807.	Correspondence between Ferdinand and Napoleon	460
	Arrest of Ferdinand	461
	The French enter Spain	462
1808.	Flight of Charles IV. prevented	463
	He signs his Abdication	464
	Napoleon's Plots against the Spanish Family	465
	Savary's Treachery	466
	Napoleon and Ferdinand at Bayonne	467
	Insurrection at Madrid	468
	Treaty of Bayonne	469
	Joseph Bonaparte accepts the Crown of Spain	470
	The Junta of Seville	471
	Rising of the Spaniards	472
	Battle of Baylen	473
	The British in the Peninsula	474
1808.	Battle of Vimeira	474
	Convention of Cintra	475
	Napoleon and Alexander at Erfurt	476
	Campaign of the French in Spain	477
	Napoleon at Madrid	—
	Retreat of Sir J. Moore	478
1809.	Battle of Corunna	—
	Austria prepares for War	479
	War between Austria and France	480
	Rising of the Tyrolese	481
	Napoleon again enters Vienna	482
	Campaign in the Tyrol, Poland, &c.	483
	Battles of Aspern and Essling	484
	Battle of Wagram	485
	Peace of Schönbrunn	—
	Its Effects	486
	Reduction of the Tyrol	487
1810.	Execution of Hofer	—

CHAPTER XV.

Napoleon at the Height of his Power.—Annexation of Holland and other Territories.—The Peninsular War.—Napoleon's Expedition to Russia (pp. 488—522).

A.D.		Page
	The *Tugendbund* and Death's Head Corps	488
1809.	Expedition to Walcheren	489
	Napoleon excommunicated	490
	The Pope in Captivity	—
	Affairs of Naples	491
1810.	Napoleon marries the Archduchess Maria Louisa	492
	Tyranny in Holland	493
	King Louis abdicates	494
	Holland and other Districts incorporated with the French Empire	495
	Progress of the French in Spain	496
	Siege of Saragossa (1809)	—
	Battle of Talavera	497
	Wellington prepares the Lines of Torres Vedras	498
1811.	Spanish Campaign	499
	Battle of Salamanca	500
	Extent of Napoleon's Empire	501
	Gigantic Plans	—
	Quarrel of Napoleon and Alexander	502
	Russia renounces the Continental System	503
1811.	War between Russia and Turkey	504
	Bernadotte elected Crown Prince of Sweden (1810)	505
	Napoleon's tyrannical Conduct towards the Swedes	506
1812.	He seizes Pomerania	507
	Important Treaty between Sweden and Russia	508
	Austria and Prussia support Napoleon	509
	Napoleon's Offers to England	510
	Breach between Russia and France	511
	Napoleon at Dresden	512
	Commencement of Hostilities	513
	Napoleon crosses the Niemen	514
	Retreat of the Russians	515
	Battle of Borodino	516
	The French enter Moscow	517
	Moscow burnt	518
	Retreat of the French	519
	Passage of the Beresina	520
	Napoleon returns to Paris	521
	Marshal Ney the Rear Guard	522

CHAPTER XVI.

General Coalition against Napoleon.—German Campaign and Overthrow at Leipsic.—Conclusion of the Peninsular War.—Napoleon at Elba.—Return, and Overthrow at Waterloo.—Death at St. Helena (pp. 523—558)

1813.	Napoleon's fresh Military Preparations	523
	He is deserted by Prussia	524
	Who allies herself with Russia	225
	Tergiversation of Austria	226
	Policy of Great Britain	527
	Sweden joins the Coalition	528
	Murat deserts the Grand Army	529
	German Campaign: Battle of Gross Görschen	530
	Battle of Bautzen	531
	Armistice of Poischwitz	532
	Fifth Coalition	533
	Battle of Gross Beeren	534
	Bavaria joins the Coalition	535
	Battle of Leipsic	536
	Declaration of Frankfort	537
	Peace of Kiel	538
	Italian Campaign	539
	The Peninsular War: Battle of Vittoria	—
	Wellington enters France	540
1813.	Restoration of Ferdinand VII.	541
	And of Pope Pius VII.	541
	The Allies enter France	542
	Treaty of Chaumont	543
	Capitulation of Paris	544
	Abdication of Napoleon	545
	He is conveyed to Elba	546
	Louis XVIII. enters Paris	547
	Peace of Paris	548
	Affairs of Italy	549
	Louis XVIII. grants a Charter	550
	Congress of Vienna	551
	Napoleon lands at Cannes	552
	Enters Paris	553
	Champ de Mai	554
	Last Campaign	555
	Battle of Waterloo	556
	Napoleon's Second Abdication	557
	Banished to St. Helena	558
	Death (1821)	—

BOOK VIII.

FROM THE FALL OF NAPOLEON I. IN 1815 TO THE CLOSE OF THE CRIMEAN WAR IN 1857.

A.D.		Page
	General Character of the Epoch	561
1815.	Second Peace of Paris	562
	Holy Alliance	563
	Ney shot	—
1818.	Congress of Aix la Chapelle	564
	The Doctrinaires	565
1820.	Duke de Berri assassinated	—
	Retrospect of Spanish History	—
	Constitution of 1812	—
1814.	Ferdinand VII. and the *Camarilla*	566
	Spanish American Colonies	—
1820.	Insurrection of Quiroga and Riego	567
	Parties in Spain	568
1822.	Civil War	—
	Ferdinand accepts a Liberal Ministry	569
	Interference of the Holy Alliance	—
1823.	The French enter Spain	570
	Ferdinand returns to Madrid	571
1824.	The Apostolic Junta	571
1827.	Insurrection of the *Aggraviados*	—
	Retrospect of Portuguese History	572
1816.	Accession of John VI.	—
1821.	He accepts a new Constitution	—
1823.	Plots of Don Miguel	573
1815.	Retrospect of Italian History	—
	Restoration of Pius VII.	—
	Of Ferdinand IV. in Naples	—
	Murat shot	—
	The *Carbonari*	574
1820.	Revolution in Naples and Sicily	—
1821.	Suppressed by Austria	575
	Revolution in Piedmont	—
	Abdication of Victor Emanuel I.	—
	State of Austria	576
	German Patriotism	577
1817.	Demonstration at the Wartburg	—
1819.	Murder of Kotzebue	—
1819.	Accession of Charles XIV. in Sweden	578
1820.	Of George IV. in England	578
1823.	Of Pope Pius VII.	—
1824.	Death of Louis XVIII.	—
	Accession of Charles X.	—
1825.	His Coronation	579
1828.	Resignation of M. Villèle	—
	Retrospect of Turkish History	—
	Reigns of Mustapha IV. and Mahmoud II.	580
	Peace of Bucharest (1812)	—
	Condition of the Turkish Empire	—
1820.	Insurrection of the Greeks	581
1824.	Progress of the Revolt	582
1825.	Death of the Emperor Alexander I.	—
	Renunciation of Constantine and Accession of Nicholas I.	—
1826.	Mahmoud II. suppresses the Janissaries	583
	Treaty of Akierman	—
1827.	Kingdom of Greece erected	584
	Battle of Navarino	585
1828.	Nicholas I. declares War against the Sultan	—
1829.	Peace of Adrianople	—
1832.	Otho of Bavaria accepts the Greek Crown	586
1829.	Polignac Ministry in France	—
	Insurrectionary Symptoms	—
1830.	The Chambers dissolved	587
	Ordinances of July	588
	Riots in Paris	589
	Municipal Commission	590
	Louis Philippe, Lieut.-General	591
	Abdication of Charles X.	592
	Louis Philippe, King of the French	593
	Death of George IV., and Accession of William IV.	—
	The "Citizen King"	594
	Disturbances in Belgium	595
	Independence proclaimed	596
	Recognised by the Five Powers	597
	Leopold I., King of the Belgians	598
1832.	Siege of Antwerp	599
1833.	Separation of Belgium and Holland	—
1830.	Insurrection in Poland	600
1832.	Poland a Russian Province	601
	Insurrections in Germany	602
	Kossuth in Hungary	—
	Accession of Pope Pius VIII. (1829)	603
	Character of Louis Philippe's Reign	—
	Lafayette dismissed	—
	The Duchess of Berri in La Vendée	604
	Attempts on Louis Philippe's Life	605

A.D.		Page
1831.	Disturbances in Italy	606
	Aided by Louis Napoleon Bonaparte	—
	His Attempt at Strasburg (1836)	607
	Charles Albert in Sardinia	—
	Louis Philippe's Avarice	608
1838.	Overthrow of the Molé Ministry	—
1840.	Ministry of M. Thiers	609
	The Eastern Question	—
	Ambition of Mehemet Ali	—
	Treaty of Hunkiar Skelessi between the Porte and Russia (1833)	—
	Mehemet Ali opposed by England	610
	Louis Napoleon's Attempt at Boulogne	611
	Body of Napoleon I. transferred to Paris	—
	The *Entente Cordiale*	—
1843.	Affair of Mr. Pritchard	—
1844.	The French in Africa	612
	Retrospect of Spanish History	—
	Ferdinand VII.'s Pragmatic Sanction	—
	His Death (1833)	613
	Accession of Isabella II.	—
	The *Estatuto Real* promulgated (1834)	—
	The *Carlists* in Biscay	—
	Affairs of Portugal; Death of John VI., 1826	614
	Accession of Donna Maria da Gloria	615
	Don Miguel usurps the Throne (1828)	—
	Don Pedro, ex-Emperor of Brazil, restores his Daughter Donna Maria (1833)	616
1836.	Affairs of Spain: Christina proclaims the Constitution of 1812	617
1840.	Dispersion of the Carlists	618
1841.	Espartero, Regent	—
1843.	Expelled by Narvaez	—
	Isabella II. declared of Age	619
	Return of Christina	—
1846.	Narvaez dismissed	—
	Louis Philippe's Intrigues respecting the Spanish Marriages	620
1847.	Discontent in France	—
1848.	Riots in Paris	621
	Abdication of Louis Philippe	622
	Provisional Government	623
	Louis Philippe flies to England	624
	Second French Republic	625
	The *Ateliers Nationaux*	626
	Reaction against Socialism	—

A.D.		Page
1848.	Louis Napoleon elected President	627
	Affairs of Germany	628
1835.	Death of Francis I., and Accession of Ferdinand I. of Austria	—
1837.	Death of William IV. and Accession of Queen Victoria	628
	The Crown of Hanover severed from that of England	—
1840.	Death of Frederick William III. of Prussia and Accession of Frederick William IV.	—
	Affairs of Hungary	629
1846.	The Schleswig-Holstein Question	—
	Welker and the Baden Resolutions	630
1848.	German *Vor-parlament*	631
	Riots in Berlin	632
	Feeble Ambition of Frederick William IV.	633
	Death of Charles XIV. of Sweden and Accession of Oscar (1844)	634
	Retrospect of Italian History	635
	Mazzini and *La Giovane Italia*	—
1846.	Accession of Pope Pius IX.	—
1848.	Insurrection in Sicily and Naples	636
	The Austrians expelled from Milan	—
	Disturbances in Hungary	638
	And Bohemia	—
	Revolution at Naples	—
	Campaign in N. Italy	639
	German National Assembly	640
	The Archduke John elected Imperial Vicar	—
	Insurrection at Vienna: Murder of Latour	641
	Abdication of Ferdinand I., and Accession of Francis Joseph	642
	Reaction in Berlin	—
1849.	Charles Albert renews the War in Italy	643
	Overthrow and Death	—
	Accession of Victor Emanuel II. and Peace with Austria	—
	War in Hungary	—
	Overthrow and Flight of Kossuth	644
	Constituent Assembly and Republic at Rome	645
	Rome occupied by the French	646
	Venice reduced by the Austrians	—
	The German Parliament dispersed	647
	War in Schleswig-Holstein	—
	Attempted Insurrection at Paris	648

A.D.		Page
1851.	Design of Napoleon to seize the Empire	649
	Coup d'état of December 2nd	650
	Napoleon elected President for Ten Years	651
1852.	Proclaimed Emperor as Napoleon III.	652
	Marriage	—
	Rivalry of Austria and Prussia	653
	The Emperor of Austria withdraws the Constitution	653
	Treaty of London respecting Schleswig-Holstein	654
	Affairs of Spain	—
	Expulsion of the English Ambassador	—
	Various Fortunes of Christina	655
1853.	Death of Donna Maria of Portugal	—
1854.	Rome under Pius IX: The Immaculate Conception	656
1853.	Nicholas I.'s Designs upon Turkey	—
	Prince Menschikoff's Message to the Divan	657
	Battles of Oltenitza and Sinope	658
1854.	Rupture between Russia and the Western Powers	—
	The Crimean War	659
	Battles of the Alma, Balaclava, &c.	660
1855.	Sardinia joins France and England	661
	Death of Nicholas I., and Accession of Alexander II.	—
	Capture of Sebastopol	662
1856.	Peace of Paris	663
1857.	Treaty of Demarcation	—

THE

HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE

TABLE OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS

FROM 1789 TO 1815.

(The Years show the end of their Reigns.)

AUSTRIA.	SPAIN.	FRANCE.	ENGLAND.	POPES.
Joseph II. . . 1790	Charles IV. . . . 1808	Louis XVI. . 1792	George III. . —	Pius VI. 1800
Leopold II. . 1792	Ferdinand VII. . . —	Republic. . . 1804		Pius VII. . . . . —
Francis II. . . —		Napoleon I. . 1815		
RUSSIA.	**PRUSSIA.**	**TURKEY.**	**DENMARK.**	**SWEDEN.**
Catherine II. . 1796	Frederick Wm. II. 1797	Selim III. . . 1807	Christian VII. 1808	Gustavus III. . . . 1792
Paul I. . . . 1801	Frederick Wm. III. —	Mustapha IV. 1808	Frederick VI. . —	Gustav. Adolph. IV. 1809
Alexander I. . —		Mahmoud II. . —		Charles XIII. . . . . —

HISTORY OF MODERN EUROPE.

BOOK VII.

FROM THE COMMENCEMENT OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION IN 1789 TO THE FALL OF NAPOLEON I. IN 1815.

CHAPTER I.

THE celebrated phrase of Louis XIV., "I am the state," proclaimed the consummation of despotism. He asserted, and it was true, that the people, as a body politic, had been annulled by the Crown. Before a century had elapsed the maxim was reversed. The head of Louis's second successor fell upon the scaffold, and the revolutionary disciples of Rousseau established the principle that the real sovereign is the people itself.

Hence it would appear that for all practical purposes the causes of the French Revolution may be sought between the reigns of Louis XIV. and Louis XVI.; or, in other words, that the inquiry may be limited to the nature of the institutions left by the former monarch, and the causes which had gradually led the people to desire their overthrow under the latter. Even within these limits the extent of the subject might demand a volume rather than a chapter. We can pretend only to indicate its principal heads, leaving the historical student to fill up the outline from his own researches.

It would be a great mistake to consider the French Revolution merely as a political one. It was likewise a social revolution of the most extensive kind. Hence its peculiar character and its most abiding results. Many nations have experienced as sudden

and violent a change in their political institutions; few or none have undergone, in a similar period of time, so complete an alteration in their habits and manners.

One of the most striking defects in the French social system under the old *régime* was the anomalous position of the nobility. The vast power of the nobles in the early days of the French monarchy, caused the Crown to regard them as rivals, and to court against them the aid of the people. This traditional policy even survived the occasion of it, and down to the very eve of the Revolution, Louis XVI. continued to regard the aristocracy as his most dangerous enemies.[1] Louis XI. and his successors had begun to undermine their power, which was terribly shaken by the wars of the League, and finally overthrown by Richelieu. One of the most successful measures adopted by the cardinal minister for that purpose was, to entice the nobles to reside in Paris by the attractions of that capital, and thus to destroy their influence in their own provinces; a policy which was continued by Louis XIV. and his successors. By the middle of the eighteenth century, the abandonment of their estates for a town life had become almost general among the nobles; few remained in the provinces who had the means of living with becoming splendour in the capital. The dissipation and extravagance in which they thus became involved, leading to their gradual impoverishment, they were compelled to sell their lands bit by bit to the peasantry; so that in the reign of Louis XVI. it was computed that five-eighths of all the land in France was in the hands of *roturiers*,[2] and for the most part of very small proprietors. Arthur Young, who travelled in France at the outbreak of the Revolution, had often seen a property of ten rods with only a single fruit tree upon it.

As the policy of Richelieu depressed the nobles, so it tended to enrich and elevate the *tiers état*, or commons. The inhabitants of towns, the commercial and manufacturing classes, made an equal, or even still more rapid, progress with the peasantry. The advance of the French people in wealth and civilisation after Richelieu's ministry is depicted in glowing colours by an author who has made that epoch his peculiar study.[3] The high roads of the kingdom, previously infested by brigands, became safe channels for the operations of trade and industry. Abundance every-

[1] Burke's observation to this effect is quoted with approbation by M. Tocqueville, *Hist. de l'Ancien Régime*, p. 218.

[2] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes de la Révolution Française*, t. i. p. 151.

[3] Jay, *Hist. du Ministère du Cardinal Richelieu*, t. ii. p. 226 sqq.

where prevailed; the fields were covered with rich crops, the towns were animated with commerce and embellished by the arts. The impulse once given went on increasing. Hence the *tiers état* that attended the States-General of 1789 bore but little resemblance to their predecessors a century or two before. Wealth had given them weight and importance; education had sharpened their intelligence, opened their eyes to the political and social abuses that prevailed, and inspired them with the desire of obtaining that influence and consideration in the state to which their altered condition justly entitled them.

Thus Richelieu's policy was ultimately followed by effects which he had neither foreseen nor intended. It contributed, in short, to make the Revolution possible. Hence the different views that have been taken by French political writers of Richelieu's character. The advocates of a constitutional monarchy, regarding a substantial aristocracy as the only sure support of a solid liberty, utterly condemn the policy of Richelieu. Montesquieu, in his *Pensées*, calls him one of the worst citizens that France had ever seen; and the same view is adopted by Madame de Staël, in her *Considérations sur la Révolution Française*. Ultra-democratic writers, on the contrary, look upon the great cardinal minister as a deliverer from aristocratic tyranny, in fact as the founder of the French nation. In their view, a royal despotism is more endurable, and more favourable to the progress of civilisation, than the despotism of an aristocracy, because it is less extensively felt, and because it is more amenable to the control of public opinion, and of such protective institutions, however imperfect, as France possessed, for instance in her Parliaments. That Louis XI. was an unfeeling tyrant, that Richelieu, as appears from his *Testament Politique*, in his heart contemned the people, is disregarded by such writers. They look only to the results, and contend, not without some show of reason, that such rulers are unjustly charged with introducing a despotism which had in fact existed long before.[4] They even acknowledge a sentiment of gratitude towards them, as the founders of the French nationality, and in this sense the authors of the Revolution. In this reasoning we behold that apparently paradoxical, but really natural alliance between extreme democracy and absolutism, which seems so suitable to the genius of the French, and which manifested itself even during the wildest excesses of the Revolution; when royal tyranny was replaced by that of a virtual dictatorship.

[4] See Bailleul, *Examen crit. de l'ouvrage de Madame de Staël*, t. i. p. 46.

But whilst in the eighteenth century the wealth and the political influence of the French nobility were almost annihilated, a titular aristocracy still remained, possessing many of the peculiar and invidious privileges of the ancient feudal times. Although the nobles were no longer obliged to make war at their own expense,[5] although they were now enregimented and received the king's pay; yet they still enjoyed that immunity from direct taxation which had been accorded to them for their military services. The profession of arms, however, was still considered as the proper destination of the nobility, and a sort of monopoly of their order. No man, except of noble birth, could become a military officer. On the very eve of the Revolution, a lieutenant in a marching regiment had to prove a nobility of at least four generations. The nobles also enjoyed a monopoly of the greater civil offices. These exclusive privileges tended to make the *noblesse* a sort of caste. A noble who engaged in trade or commerce forfeited his rights and privileges.[6] As it is computed that there were in France, in 1789, 40,000 noble families, comprising some 200,000 persons,[7] the invidiousness of these privileges must have been very extensively felt.

Of the whole nobility, however, there were not 200 families that really belonged to those ancient races which prided themselves, though even here mostly without foundation, on their Frankish origin, and on holding their estates and dignities by right of conquest. Their titles had been mostly purchased. The practice of selling patents of nobility had been adopted by the French kings at a very early period, though it was not carried to any great extent till the sixteenth century. It was resorted to partly as a means of depressing the order, partly as an expedient to raise money. Charles IX. issued a vast number of these patents, and his successor Henry III. is said to have created no fewer than a thousand nobles. *Roturiers* were sometimes compelled to buy these patents, which were even issued with the name in blank. Louis XIV. granted 500 letters of nobility in a single year.

The feudal privileges enjoyed by the nobles, or by those who had stepped into their places, were very grievously felt in the rural districts. Even where the land was no longer in the hands

[5] The *ban* and *arrière ban*, a vast and undisciplined mob which the nobles had been accustomed to furnish, had been called out for the last time in 1674. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol. Française*, Introd. p. ci.

[6] Glass-making alone seems to have been an exception. See *Granier de Cassagnac*, t. i. p. 141. A noble degraded by commerce, might, however, reinstate himself by purchasing *lettres de réhabilitation*.

[7] *Ibid.* p. 146. Some writers, however, estimate them at a considerably lower number.

of a seigneur, the feudal rights attached to it, or what was called *la servitude de la terre*, still remained in force, though held perhaps by neighbouring proprietors almost as poor as the peasant who was subject to them.[8] In some instances these rights had been acquired by the Crown, and the peasant was compelled to labour gratuitously, often at a distance from his home, in making roads, building barracks, and other works of a like description, experiencing at the same time the most brutal and unfeeling treatment. Besides this compulsory task-work, called the *corvée*, the peasant saw his fields exposed without defence to the ravages of game; he was obliged to pay heavy market-tolls, to make use of a certain ferry, to have his corn ground at a particular mill, his bread baked at a particular oven. Not the least among these feudal grievances were the *justices seigneuriales* or private courts of justice attached to certain titles and possessions. The proprietors of these courts, of which there are said to have been more than 2,400, leagued themselves with the parliaments against the reforms in the administration of justice proposed by the royal edict of May 8th 1788; in the preamble of which it is stated that trifling civil causes had often to undergo six hearings.

The nobles, having often little interest in the land except the title and the feudal privileges which it conferred, were disposed to exercise these privileges without any consideration for those who were subject to them. It requires no very profound knowledge of human nature to foretell the consequences of such a relationship between the privileged and non-privileged classes. Where great pretensions are supported by little real power, pride becomes more sensitive and exacting; while in those subjected to its caprices, contempt mingles with hatred. Madame de Stäel, an acute observer of her own times, remarks that the different classes in France entertained a mutual antipathy for one another.[9] In no other country were the gentry so estranged from the rest of the nation; its contact with those below them served only to wound. Hence even the elegant manners of the *noblesse*, the most estimable part perhaps of the ancient *régime*, and which it was difficult to imitate, served only to increase the envy inspired by the exclusive prerogatives of that class: a circumstance which may account for much of the cynicism and *sans-culotterie* of the Revolution.

The burgesses, like the peasantry, were oppressed by peculiar

[8] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, liv. ii. ch. i. [9] *Considérations, &c.*, Partie iii. ch. xv.

burthens originating in the middle ages. The trade of France was monopolised by guilds and corporations, which fettered independent industry by a system of *maîtrises* and *jurandes*, and thus even the *bourgeoisie* had its aristocracy. A stranger, or non-freeman, could not become an apprentice even to the meanest trade, without paying a considerable premium. On the expiration of his apprenticeship, a young man became a *compagnon* and was entitled to wages; but a long interval must still elapse before he could set up for himself as a *maître juré*, or master in his trade; and this again entailed heavy expenses. Even a Paris flower-girl had to pay 200 livres to become a *maîtresse*. On the other hand, the son of a *maître* could avoid these expenses by being apprenticed to his father. Hence trades came to be perpetuated in certain families, and an exclusive system was formed which gave occasion to perpetual disputes. The publishers were continually disputing with the booksellers as to the difference between an old book and a new one; and many thousand lawsuits are said to have taken place between the tailors and second-hand clothiers without settling the distinction between a new coat and an old one. The very beggars had their privileges, and it was only those belonging to a certain order called *trôniers* who were entitled to ask alms at the door of a church.[10]

Among other relics of the feudal times, the ecclesiastical system of France was also opposed to the growing spirit of the age. We now speak of the French Church only as a corporation; its teaching and practice will claim our attention further on. The clergy were a landed aristocracy, and like the nobles were exempt from direct taxation; or rather they claimed the privilege of taxing themselves by what were called *dons gratuits*, or voluntary offerings. The collection of tithes brought them into direct collision with that numerous body of small landed proprietors, which, as we have already said, had now sprung up in France; and thus the notice of an inquiring age was all the more strongly attracted to the flagrant abuses which prevailed in the Church. The higher ecclesiastical dignities were mostly filled by the younger sons of noble families, and were no longer, according to the spirit of their institution, the rewards of virtue, piety, and a zealous discharge of their holy functions. While some of the hierarchy were rolling in untold wealth, and displaying anything but those Christian virtues which should characterise their profession, the ecclesiastics who really performed the duties of the Church had in many cases scarcely wherewithal to support a

[10] See L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Franc.*, t. i. liv. iii. ch. 3.

decent existence. The abuses of the property belonging to the regular clergy, or monastic orders, were especially notorious. The revenues of many abbeys, so far from being applied to ecclesiastical purposes, were often enjoyed by laymen.

The arbitrary power of the Crown shared the hatred felt by the people for the privileges of the aristocracy, both lay and clerical. The French Government was indeed, both in theory and practice, a perfect despotism. The King was the sole legislative and supreme executive power. He could dispose of the property of his subjects by imposts and confiscations, and of their persons by *lettres de cachet*. Thus France had no constitution; which is equivalent to saying that the social structure had no secure foundation. Had the States-General or National Assembly continued to subsist, the long-standing abuses which we have before described would probably have been gradually abolished, instead of remaining to be swept away by the convulsions of a revolution. The only constitutional principle that could be perceived was, as Madame de Stäel observes, that the Crown was hereditary. Public opinion, and the passive and always unavailing resistance of the Parliaments, were the sole checks upon the exercise of the royal prerogative. A dangerous result of this all-disposing power of the Crown, was that the people looked up to it for everything, even for aid in their private affairs, and attributed to it the most inevitable calamities. If agriculture was in a bad state, it was ascribed to want of succour from the Government; in times of scarcity, which frequently occurred in the eighteenth century, the different districts looked to their *Intendant*, or administrator, for food. Every misery, even the badness of the seasons, was imputed to the Government.[11] It is easy to see how such a feeling might become in times of commotion a dangerous element of discontent; nor will proofs of such effects be wanting in the following narrative. The caprices and injustice of the Government added to the general indignation. Royal domains that had been sold were reseized; privileges granted in perpetuity were constantly revoked. Towns, communities, even hospitals and charitable institutions, were compelled to fail in their engagements in order to lend money to the Crown.

Besides the invidious and oppressive privileges of the nobles, the monopolies of guilds and corporations, the abuses in the hierarchy, and the arbitrary power of the sovereign, the anomalous condition of the French provinces was another source of discontent. Although Richelieu had consolidated the authority

[11] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 106 sq.

of the Crown throughout France, he had not amalgamated its various provinces; which differed so widely in their systems of law, religion and finance, that they could hardly be said to form one kingdom. There was France of the *Langue d'oc*, subject to the Roman law, and France of the *Langue d'oil*, obeying the common law; France of the *Concordat*, and France of the *Pays d'obédience* more immediately subject to the papal power; France of the *Pays d'élection* and France of the *Pays d'états*. These anomalies chiefly arose from the gradual manner in which the monarchy had been developed. Down to the twelfth century, the patrimony of the French Crown continued to be only the province of the Isle of France, with Paris for its capital, together with the Orleanais and a few adjacent districts. The King's authority over the rest of France was rather that of a feudal suzerain than of a sovereign. By marriage, bequest, confiscation, conquest and other means, these slender possessions had been augmented, before the reign of Louis XVI., to between thirty and forty provinces; embracing, with the exception of Avignon and the Venaissin, which still belonged to the Pope, the whole of modern France.

Of these provinces, acquired at such different times and in such various ways, many had continued to retain their peculiar laws and privileges. On a general view, the most important distinction between them was that of *Pays d'élection* and *Pays d'états*. The *Pays d'élection* were so called because originally the territorial taxes were assessed by certain magistrates called *élus* (persons chosen or elected), whose fiscal jurisdiction was entitled an *Election*. In early times these magistrates had really been chosen by the communities, a practice which ceased under Charles VII., though the name was still retained. As a general rule, the *Pays d'élection* were the provinces most anciently united to the Crown. The *Pays d'états* derived their name from the *states*, or administrative assemblies, which they had possessed before their union with the monarchy, and were allowed subsequently to retain. The provinces comprised under this name were Rousillon, Brittany, Provence, Languedoc, Burgundy, Franche Comté, Dauphiné, Alsace, the *Trois Evêchés* (Metz, Toul, and Verdun), Flanders, Hainault, Lorraine and Corsica. In these provinces the administration was vested, nominally at least—for the authority of the Crown often overrode their ancient constitutions—in the States. The right of sitting in these assemblies, was attached, with regard to the clergy, to certain preferments, with regard to the nobles, to certain families, and with regard to the *tiérs état*, or burgesses,

to certain offices. Some of these provinces, by virtue of treaties concluded with the Crown, claimed an immunity from various taxes. In such cases the Crown fixed the contribution of each province, and the privilege of the states consisted principally in determining the method in which it should be assessed. Hence the King was said to *demand* a tax of the *Pays d'états*, and to *impose* it on the *Pays d'élection*.

This state of things was attended with great inconvenience and many evils. One of the most striking of these was the enormous difference which prevailed, perhaps in contiguous provinces, in the duties on the same article, and consequently in its price. In some provinces, for instance, as Bretagne and the Artois, there was no *gabelle* or salt tax, while in others it was oppressive. In the free provinces salt was worth only from two to eight livres the quintal, while in those subject to the *grande gabelle* it sold for sixty-two livres. The Crown alone enjoyed the right to sell salt, and in the provinces subject to the *gabelle* its consumption was obligatory; every person above seven years of age was compelled to purchase seven pounds annually at the *Grenier du Roi*.[12] A cask of wine passing from the Orleanais into Normandy increased at least twentyfold in price, while goods from China could be imported at only five times their original cost. The taxes were chiefly assessed on the most necessary articles of life, such as bread, salt, meat, and wine; so that the burthen was thrown on the poor. Salt alone contributed fifty-four million livres to the revenue. The great difference in the duties on the same articles in different provinces made the same precautions necessary to prevent smuggling between them as if they had been foreign countries, and an army of 50,000 men was employed to guard 1200 leagues of internal barriers. It was estimated that smuggling and the illicit manufacture of salt occasioned annually 4000 domiciliary visits, 3400 imprisonments, and 500 convictions, some of which were capital.[13] In years of scarcity these barriers produced the greatest inconvenience and distress by preventing the ready transit of grain from one district to another. The independent fiscal system of the provinces also rendered possible to persons in authority that infamous peculation to which we have already alluded in the instance in which Louis XV. himself was implicated in 1771, and consigned to infamy under the name of the *Pacte de famine*.[14]

[12] Necker, *Administration des Finances*, t. ii. p. 12 sqq.

[13] *Ordonnance des Gabelles*, 1680, tit. vi. ap. Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Franç.*, t. i. p. 506; Necker, *Ibid.*, t. i. ch. viii.; *Mém. de Calonne aux Notables*, No. viii.; Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. i. p. 183.

[14] See Vol. III. p. 520.

These very anomalies, however, created a necessity for a strong central government. It was by this method that Richelieu obviated, or at least palliated, the inconveniences which it lay not in his power to remove. Under his ministry, all France was divided, for fiscal and administrative purposes, into thirty-two districts called *généralités*, each under the superintendence of an *Intendant*, who was commonly selected from the *maîtres des requêtes* attached to the royal council. His functions were to direct the construction and maintenance of high roads, bridges, &c.; to superintend hospitals, prisons, and the relief of the poor; to take care that taxes were equitably assessed, and justice impartially administered, with other duties of the like kind. The *Intendants* in central France were dependent on the Controller of Finance, those in the frontier provinces on the Secretary at War. Thus the whole kingdom was subjected to the surveillance of the King and his ministers, and a system of centralisation was inaugurated that materially contributed to render Paris, as it were, the censorium of France—a system, the disastrous effects of which upon the Revolution will claim our attention in the sequel.

Thus France was divided politically into *Provinces*, financially into *Generalities*, administratively into *Intendancies*, militarily into *Governments*, ecclesiastically into *Dioceses*, and judicially into *Bailiwicks* and *Sénéchaussées* or *Sheriffwicks*.

When we further consider that the various provinces possessed different laws and customs, it will appear that France under the ancient *régime* resembled rather a confederation of separate states than a united kingdom. There were Gascons, Normans, Bretons, Picards, &c., but a French nation can hardly be said to have existed.

The regulations of Richelieu were a terrible blow to the anarchy that was so profitable to the nobles connected with the finances. But the greatest disorder and abuse still continued to prevail in that department. One province was ignorant of the condition of another; the total amount of direct taxation was known only by the King's council. The *fermiers généraux* or *traitants*, to whom the taxes were farmed, treated France like a conquered country. The galleys, the prisons, the gallows were at their service. No man could tell the amount of their gains. But out of them they had to make large presents to courtiers and mistresses. Even the King himself, when they closed their accounts, condescended to receive from them large sums of gold in velvet purses.[15] And not unfrequently the arm of the law or the strong hand of power compelled them to disgorge their ill-gotten wealth.

[15] Monteil, *Hist. des Français*, t. x.; *Decade des onze soupers*, ap. Blanc, liv. iii. ch. iii.

That such a state of things as we have here described should have been altered and reformed without some great moral convulsion, seems next to impossible. An attempt had been made by the assembling of the Notables, but they had refused to abandon any of their privileges. The abuses in the Church, the unjust prerogatives of the aristocracy, the arbitrary and unlimited power of the Crown, could not be reformed by any peaceable and legal method; the means were wanting—France had no constitution. Nothing therefore remained but revolution. The fiscal and administrative abuses were perhaps more susceptible of amendment, yet even here little had been done, though the subject had long occupied the attention of French statesmen.

One of the first, and perhaps the most distinguished of this kind of reformers was the Marquis d'Argenson, minister for foreign affairs in 1744, and previously *Intendant* of Hainault. His treatise entitled *Considérations sur le Gouvernement de France*, published in 1740, and consequently several years before the appearance of the *Encyclopédie*, contains many liberal principles. He was for doing away with the invidious fiscal privileges of the nobles, abolishing Protestant disabilities, and making all alike admissible to public office. But his scheme presents no bold and striking outline. The main feature of it was to divide France by degrees into new departments and *arrondissemens*, which were all to be endowed with an administration resembling that of the *Pays d'états*. Thus there was to be a municipal council in each parish; an assembly in each district composed of deputies from the different parishes, and the states of the province or department, formed of deputies for the district. But these bodies were to be intrusted only with the administration of their local concerns. They were to have no voice in the general affairs of the kingdom, nor could anything be submitted to them that had not first been sanctioned by the King. In a word, he would have created a multitude of little provincial democracies under a central despotism.

Among the administrative reformers were the *Physiocrats* and the *Economists*. *Physiocracy*, or the government of nature, derived its name from the fundamental tenet of the sect, that the soil alone was the source of all wealth, its cultivators the only productive class, the rest of the world was designated as *classe stérile*. Quesnay, physician to Madame de Pompadour, was the founder of this sect. They denounced such institutions as stood in the way of their theories; but they had no wish to diminish the absolute power of the Crown; on the contrary, they considered

it essential to their purposes, and better adapted to them than English liberty. We are not, therefore, surprised to find that some of them felt an extraordinary admiration for China! where an absolute, yet unprejudiced sovereign cultivated the earth once a year with his own hands, in honour of the useful arts; where all places were obtained by literary competition; where philosophy took the place of religion, and learning was a title to aristocracy.[16] Some of the physiocrats held a sort of socialist doctrine, as Morelly, who, in his *Code de la Nature*, published in 1754, advocated the community of goods. This school made a great parade of analysis and philosophical method, though their main theory was not a very wise one. The earth, as the sole source of all wealth, was to bear the whole burthen of taxation; and hence their grand aim was to augment the net product of the land; in other words, the rent of the landed proprietor; and bread was to be made dear, in order that agriculture might flourish! It was to ridicule this school, that Voltaire wrote his *Homme aux* 40 *écus*.

Side by side with this school, grew up another, that of the Economists, whose attention was directed to commerce. Opposed on other points to the views of the *Physiocrats*, they held one doctrine in common with them—the removal of all restrictions. The mottoes common to both schools were *laissez faire, laissez passer*. The Marquis of Mirabeau, father of the orator, belonged to the Economists, and was among the first advocates of free trade, especially in corn. In a passage of his *Ami des Hommes*,[17] he asks: "In order to maintain abundance in a kingdom, what should be done?—Nothing." Thus he opened the road, though often erroneously and inadequately, which was afterwards improved and completed by Adam Smith. The virtuous Turgot, whose constant aim was the good of the people, was the most eminent member of this school. The views of Turgot embraced the abolishment of *corvées* and *jurandes*, the suppression of provincial barriers and custom-houses, the establishment of a free trade in corn, and the compelling the nobles and clergy to contribute to the taxes. It was Turgot who first asserted, in his article *Fondation* in the *Encyclopédie*, that church lands were national property.

It was not, however, such gradual and incomplete reforms, even if these could have been carried without some convulsion, that could satisfy the present temper of the French nation. Instead of lopping off a few abuses of the ancient *régime*, a spirit was abroad that was to overthrow both the throne and the altar,

[16] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 249.
[17] Tom. iii. *Commerce Etranger*, p. 40.

and to shake society to its foundations. This spirit had been engendered by the literature and pseudo philosophy of the eighteenth century. The material progress of the middle classes, to which we have already adverted, accompanied with a corresponding advance in their manners and education, had produced an apt and ready audience for its doctrines. The citizen had become as enlightened as the noble in the philosophy and literature which then prevailed; for Paris was the common source whence all derived their lights, and had impressed upon all a nearly uniform way of thinking. Into the effects of this new philosophy we must now inquire.

The French literature of the seventeenth century, formed under the auspices of Richelieu, Mazarine, and Louis XIV., had been developed in the spirit of the anti-reformation, and rested on classical antiquity, the Roman Catholic religion, and absolute monarchy. It had been encouraged by Richelieu and his successors as a means of extending their own as well as the national glory; nor can it be denied that it had a vast effect in promoting French influence abroad. Richelieu, however, seems to have felt some apprehension of the consequences it might one day produce at home. In a remarkable passage of his *Testament Politique*, he almost foretells the spirit of the eighteenth century, and betrays his anxiety to prevent the diffusion of knowledge among the vulgar; unconscious, that its floodgates when once opened, cannot again be closed.[18]

Already before the end of the seventeenth century, symptoms had begun to appear of a change in the literary taste of the nation. The almost superstitious reverence for classical antiquity was the first idol to be destroyed, and Perrault's attack on the ancients was the harbinger of a new era. The French writers of the eighteenth century sought their inspiration not in classical, but in modern literature, especially the English. After this school, they began to occupy themselves with questions of politics and religion; to discuss the elementary principles of society as they may be discovered by the light of reason and the law of nature; and to investigate the grounds of religious belief. Thus the age of Bossuet and Pascal was succeeded by that of Voltaire, Rousseau, and the encyclopædists.

Infidelity had, indeed, taken root in France before the close of Louis XIV.'s reign, under the auspices of the profligate Duke of

[18] "Si les lettres étoient profanées à toutes sortes d'esprits, on verrait plus de gens capables de former des doutes que de les résoudre, et beaucoup seraient plus propres à s'opposer aux vérités qu'à les défendre." Ch. ii. § 10.

Vendôme and his brother; and it was in this school that the Duke de Chartres, afterwards the Regent Orléans, imbibed his principles of atheism and immorality. It is the nature of extremes to produce their opposites; and there can be little doubt that disgust at the bigotry, superstition, and hypocrisy which marked the later years of Louis XIV., contributed to produce this deplorable reaction.

The infidelity of this school, however, would not probably have spread itself among the great mass of the nation, but for the writers who subsequently sprang up. Fontenelle was their precursor, whose long life, extending from the middle of the seventeenth to the middle of the eighteenth century, rendered him the connecting link between the literature of the two periods. Not that Fontenelle can be exactly styled an infidel author. He was, as M. Villemain remarks, but the discreet echo of the bolder thinkers, such as Bayle and others, who wrote in Holland. Yet his writings are marked by a certain want of orthodoxy, a disposition to question received opinions, and to treat grave subjects in that tone of *badinage* which became characteristic of the eighteenth century. Such especially is the style of his *Histoire des Oracles*, while his *Dialogues of the Dead* betray a genius kindred with that of Lucian.

Lord Bolingbroke, and the Club of the Entre-sol, which he founded during his banishment in France, tended greatly to promote the liberalism and infidelity of the eighteenth century, and to give them a literary and philosophical turn. Among the most remarkable members of the club of the Entre-sol, was the Abbé de St. Pierre, whose works, says M. de Villemain,[19] present the programme of a social revolution so bold and complete as to astonish even J. J. Rousseau. But Montesquieu must perhaps be regarded as the first writer whose works had any direct influence upon the French Revolution.

After travelling over great part of Europe, Montesquieu took up his abode in England, in 1729. Here he applied himself to the study of our constitution, for which he imbibed a great admiration, as appears from his panegyric on it in the eleventh book of his *Esprit des Lois*, published about twenty years afterwards. At first, however, this, his greatest work, was not understood by his countrymen. They were hardly yet ripe for serious political studies, and Montesquieu's first work, the *Lettres Persanes*, seems to have given them a wrong idea of his genius. In the disguise of Eastern masquerade, Montesquieu in that work aimed some sly

[19] *Tableaux de Littérature Franç.*, Partie ii. Leçon xiv.

blows at French customs and institutions; and hence, while uttering in the *Esprit des Lois* his earnest convictions, he was still regarded by many of his countrymen only as a concealed satirist. His book was much better received in England, and it was only by Frenchmen of the next generation that it began to be duly understood and appreciated.

Montesquieu must be regarded as the father of that school of reformers, including Necker, Lally Tollendal, Mounier and others, who at the commencement of the French Revolution wished to establish in France a constitution on the English model. Hence, in the vain pursuit of institutions, which, it may be confidently asserted, would never have suited the genius of the French nation, they were led to assist the beginnings of a movement which it was not afterwards in their power to stop. There was no analogy whatever between the France of 1789 and England at any period of its history. The want of an aristocracy influential through its dignities and wealth, yet without particular privileges, except that of an hereditary peerage, and identified in its private interests with the great mass of the people, would alone have rendered English institutions impossible in France. The democratic inclinations of the French, their military habits, their large standing army, all tended the same way. The principles of Montesquieu obtained however, at length, a sort of triumph in the Charter of 1814; which appears to have been founded on the scheme of a constitution modelled on that of England, and submitted by Lally Tollendal to the Constituent Assembly.[20]

Voltaire, who also acquired much of his philosophy in England, had a far greater influence than Montesquieu on the French Revolution. Not, however, from any love of constitutional liberty. Voltaire throughout his life was an aristocrat and a royalist, *quand même*. The son of a notary, he drops the paternal name of Arouet, assumes the title of Mons. de Voltaire, and mixes in the highest circles of Paris. And what society might not have been proud of him? what circle would not have been adorned by his wit and genius? Unfortunately, however, his talent for satire produced effects calculated to remind him unpleasantly of his plebeian origin. He offended a young nobleman, the Chevalier de Rohan, who caused him to be horse-whipped, and in reply to a demand for satisfaction, obtained a *lettre de cachet* that consigned him to the Bastille, whence he was released only to be banished into England. Here was enough to have cured most men of a love of aristocracy and despotism. Not so with Voltaire. On his

[20] See L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. iii. p. 64.

return we find him throwing himself at the feet of Madame de Pompadour, nay, of Madame du Barri; courting Louis XV. by every means in his power; degrading his fine genius by representing that vicious and profligate monarch under the character of Trajan in a little piece entitled *Le Temple de Gloire*,[21] which he wrote for the theatre of Versailles; meanly thrusting himself in the King's way after the performance, to catch the smile and the approving word that were to reward him; and when repulsed with the most marked disdain, for Louis liked neither his principles nor person, still retaining all the devotion of loyalty. Thus as late as 1771, during the quarrel between Louis XV. and his Parliaments, we find him writing: "For my part, I think the King is right; and if we must serve, it is better to serve under a lion of a good house, than under two hundred rats of my own kind." He showed the same complacency towards foreign potentates. Failing to attract the notice of his own court, he became the guest and literary satellite of Frederick II. of Prussia; and though ultimately treated with the grossest indignity and insult by that monarch, condescended to congratulate him on his victory at Rossbach. He approved of Catherine II.'s arbitrary designs against the national existence of Poland and Turkey.[22] Nay, we even find him corresponding with that sovereign on the shameful and secret events of her private life, and venturing to bestow upon her the name of Semiramis; whilst the Empress, so far from being offended at the equivocal compliment, tells him "that the eldest of the Orloffs has the soul of a Roman, that he is worthy of the best times of the Republic."[23]

How, then, did Voltaire contribute to the Revolution? Solely by his attacks on the established religion. Between the Church and a tyranny that founds itself on divine right, the connection is so close that one cannot well be shaken without endangering the other. The sceptical nature of Voltaire's writings had, moreover, a natural tendency to sap belief in all fixed principles whatsoever. The overthrow of the Church, the absorption of ecclesiastical property, the proclamation of the Age of Reason, are among the most marked and striking features of the French Revolution; and they must be ascribed in the main to the teaching of Voltaire.

Voltaire's scepticism, if not imbibed, was at least confirmed, by his residence in England. His study of the English deistical writers, as Shaftesbury, Toland and others, and his friendship and

[21] See Marmontel, *Mémoires*.

[22] See his letters of January 1st and November 2nd 1772.

[23] Villemain, *Œuvres*, t. ix. p. 356.

intercourse with Lord Bolingbroke, gave it a body and a method. From the study of Locke's metaphysical works he imbibed the theory of Sensation; a doctrine which was afterwards developed in France by Condillac in his *Traité des Sensations*, and laid the foundation of the materialism of the French Encyclopædists. Voltaire's residence in England, during which he obtained a very considerable mastery of our language, imbued him with much admiration for our literature and customs. Hence he contributed to spread in France what has been called the *Anglomania*; which, by promoting travelling in England, studying the English language, reading English newspapers, and even affecting English tastes and manners, undoubtedly became a strong predisposing cause of the Revolution.[24]

It was natural that on his return to France Voltaire should be struck with the different state of things that he found there. Having studied in England the philosophy of Newton, he drew up his *Système du Monde* to explain it to his countrymen; but the chancellor d'Aguesseau refused his *visa* to the publication. Such was the narrow spirit which then prevailed among the French authorities, and especially in the Church! All new ideas were looked upon as dangerous, even the most certain and demonstrable conclusions of science. Cardinal Polignac, a fashionable Latin poet of that day, had denounced Newton's discovery in his *Anti-Lucretius*, as a dangerous reminiscence of Democritus and Epicurus![25] Still worse was the fate of Voltaire's *Lettres Philosophiques sur les Anglais*, which he published soon after his return to France, and which contained much praise of our customs and institutions. The Parliament of Paris ordered them to be burnt by the common hangman, and deprived the publisher of his *maîtrise*. Voltaire afterwards recast them in his *Dictionnaire Philosophique*.

Such treatment was not likely to increase Voltaire's respect for the Church. And indeed there was much in its practice that might serve to explain, and to a certain extent to justify, the hostility of an observant philosopher. The higher clergy were often open profligates and atheists; while that portion, including the Jansenists, which pretended to devotion, exhibited little more than an anile superstition united with a bloody persecuting spirit. What should be thought of a Church in which the profligate Abbé Dubois could obtain a cardinal's hat, as well as the archbishopric of Cambray, the see of the virtuous Fénélon? And could find two bishops, one the illustrious Massillon, to vouch for

[24] Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 37 sq. [25] Villemain, pt. i. leç. i.

his orthodoxy and worthiness? Prelates of high rank lived in open adultery and fornication; as Cardinal Montmorenci, Grand Almoner of France, with Madame de Choiseul, an abbess. The Bernardine monks of Granselve, in the department of Gers, celebrated their patron's fête with orgies that lasted a fortnight, to which women were admitted, and in which all sorts of excesses were perpetrated.[26] These scandalous scenes were diversified not only with the ridiculous disputes about the *billets de confession*, the exhibitions of the convulsionaries, &c., already related, but also with cruel and revolting persecutions. In February 1762, in pursuance of a sentence of the Parliament of Toulouse, Rochette, a Protestant pastor, was hanged for having exercised his ministry in Languedoc. Soon after, Calas, another Protestant of Toulouse, was broken on the wheel on the false accusation of having killed his son in order to prevent his turning Catholic. Voltaire protected Calas' widow and children, who had themselves been subjected to torture; and by bold and persevering efforts vindicated the memory of Calas and obtained an indemnification for his family, by procuring a revision and reversal of his sentence. At a later period he interfered, but with less success, for another victim of clerical fury. In 1766, two young officers, La Barre and D'Etallonde, were prosecuted by the Bishop of Amiens for mutilating a crucifix erected on a bridge at Abbeville. D'Etallonde escaped by flight; La Barre was convicted on very vague testimony, and sentenced by the Jansenist court of Abbeville to have his hand and tongue amputated, and to be burnt alive. The Parliament of Paris, on appeal, confirmed the sentence in spite of all Voltaire's efforts; according, however, to the criminal the favour of being beheaded instead of being burnt.[27] If such scenes were calculated to excite the indignation of a philosophic observer, the intellectual state of the Church might inspire him with contempt. Its glories had been extinguished with Bossuet and the eminent prelates of the age of Louis XIV.; since which period its intellect had sunk in an inverse ratio to the growing enlightenment of the age.

Hence the Church, like the other institutions of France, contributed to its own destruction. Unhappily, however, the opposition which it engendered, not content with attacking the Church alone, aimed at upsetting Christianity itself; just as the monarchy perished in the attacks directed against its abuses. But

[26] See the account of the Abbé Montgaillard, an eye-witness, in his *Hist. de France*, t. ii. p. 246.

[27] See Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 140 sq.

for these results, the authors and abettors of these abuses are mainly responsible. Revolutions act by extremes, just as the overstrained bow regains not its equilibrium till it has been equally distorted in an opposite direction.

The popular form in which Voltaire disseminated his principles procured for them a ready and extensive circulation. In England the attacks upon religion were made in a learned and didactic manner, and hence they were little read except by the higher and more educated classes, while the popular literature was rather of a religious cast. Voltaire's attacks were often insinuated in a novel or a poem, and being indirect were perhaps the more effective. The stealthy blow finds us unguarded, and our self-love is flattered by being left to apply a covert insinuation. The *Pucelle* was calculated to degrade at once the national and the religious traditions of France. In the *Henriade* a higher subject is treated in a more elevated tone; but the apotheosis of Henry IV. implies the condemnation of Louis XIV., and the praises of the author of the Edict of Nantes are a concealed satire on its abolisher. Voltaire first made history entertaining, released it from its pedantic fetters, and communicated to it graces hitherto deemed incompatible with the gravity proper to its style. At the same time he made it subservient to his attacks upon the Church. Adopting in his *Essai sur les Mœurs* the exactly contrary principle to that followed by Bossuet in his *Discours sur l'histoire universelle*, Voltaire attributed all the misfortunes of the Middle Ages to Christianity and the faults and errors of the clergy. By this tone of mockery, as an eminent critic has observed,[28] Voltaire altered the truth of history, and failed in the very object which he chiefly professed, an impartial judgment of the different historical epochs. The same writer observes that Voltaire is not so incorrect in his facts as is generally represented. His chief fault is that he substitutes caricature for a true picture of the human mind. His *Siècle de Louis XIV.* is less marked with this defect, and is in every way his best and most trustworthy historical production. At a later period he assailed religion in a more direct and formal manner in his *Philosophical Dictionary*, but not perhaps with such popular success.

Voltaire's wit, vivacity, and admirable style made him the most popular of authors. No writer, perhaps, has exercised a greater and more general influence on his age. It was not in France alone that he was regarded as the apostle of Reason, and the harbinger of a new era. Many of the sovereigns and statesmen

[28] Villemain, leç. xvi.

of Europe, Frederick the Great of Prussia, Catherine II. of Russia,, Joseph II. of Austria, were among his admirers and correspondents. He even exchanged compliments with Pope Benedict XIV. about his tragedy of *Mahomet*; and Cardinal Quirini amused himself with translating the *Henriade* into Latin verse. It was through Voltaire's inspiration that D'Aranda in Spain, Pombal in Portugal, were led to expel the Jesuits. Pombal caused the works of Voltaire and Diderot to be translated into the Portuguese language. Thus through the medium of England, the spirit of the Reformation, degenerating into scepticism, re-operated through the genius of Voltaire upon the most bigoted nations of Europe.

Sarcasm and ridicule were Voltaire's great weapons, and to an institution like the French Church of that day none could have been more dangerous. No man ever had a keener eye for absurdity and hypocrisy, nor a keener relish in exposing them. His mind, nevertheless, was endowed with some poetical fervour, and hence he recoiled from the cold and repulsive doctrine of materialism, and from the philosophy of the Encyclopædists. Voltaire believed in a Deity; and what man had more cause than he to think that his soul, the source of so many brilliant emanations, was something more than a product of brute matter? He may even be suspected of a lingering affection for the Church which he had reviled. It is at least certain that in his last visit to Paris, he was induced during a dangerous illness to receive the sacrament;[29] and that he helped to erect a church near his château at Ferney.

The philosophical school known as the Encyclopædists, who outran their master Voltaire, were the contemporaries of his later years. D'Holbach, a rich German baron, was their Mæcenas. D'Holbach had himself some literary pretensions, and was the author of the *Système de la Nature*, the most complete code of atheism that had yet appeared. D'Holbach gave the philosophers two dinners a week for a period of forty years; whence the Abbé Galliani called him the *Maître d'Hôtel de la Philosophie*. His table was frequented by Diderot, d'Alembert, Helvétius, Grimm, Raynal, and other *beaux esprits* of the day. Most of these were contributors to the famous *Encyclopédie*, whence the school derived their name. This storehouse of knowledge, projected by Diderot in 1750, was the first work of the kind, and was intended also to be a vehicle for the propagation of liberal opinions. Diderot's chief assistant was D'Alembert, a man of great

[29] Condorcet, *Vie de Voltaire*, *Œuvres*, t. i. p. 294; Grimm, *Correspondance*, *&c.* t. x. p. 22.

mathematical attainments; who was intrusted with the writing of the preface, intended to throw a veil over the principles advocated in the work. From this school also proceeded many separate works aimed against the Church and the monarchy. Of all its members, Diderot had the most original genius; several of his works, which take a wide range from philosophy to comedy and romance, have considerable merit; but he was desultory in his studies, and deficient in that application by which alone great things can be produced. Among the works of his associates the best known are Helvétius's treatise *De l'homme*, a poor production, borrowed from the thoughts of his predecessors and contemporaries; and the Abbé Raynal's *Histoire des établissemens des Européens dans les deux Indes*. In this last, in many respects valuable work, Raynal contrived to insert denunciations against kings which seem hardly to belong to his subject. Some of the chapters are said to have been written by Diderot. Raynal was ultimately bought by the Court, and wrote, in 1791, a censure of the Revolution.[30]

But among the guests at De Holbach's table, by far the most remarkable was Jean Jacques Rousseau. He did not, however, long remain a member of that brilliant society. Naturally of an unsocial disposition, Rousseau seems to have felt ill at ease among men whose position in life was superior to his own, and who had established a literary reputation, to which, though already past middle life, he was only beginning to aspire. Marmontel, who was also one of D'Holbach's guests, has left us a picture of Rousseau at this period, "before he had become savage." "Nobody," he says, "better observed the dreary maxim to live with his friends as if they were one day to become his enemies. Yet as his delicate and irritable self-love was well known, he was treated with the same attentions as would have been bestowed on a pretty but vain and capricious woman, whom one might desire to please."[31] It may be, also, that his disapproval of the tenets of those philosophers, which at all events formed a strong contrast to his own, was among his motives for withdrawing into solitude.

Rousseau's writings had more influence on the French Revolution than those of any other author whatsoever. The Emperor Napoleon I. expressly ascribed it to Rousseau's "ideology." We may perhaps attribute this influence to the following causes. The French, as we have already remarked, had no constitution; they had therefore to build up their new institutions from the very

[30] Montgaillard, *Hist. de France*, t. ii. p. 329. That writer had seen Raynal's receipt for 24,000 francs.

[31] Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 327 sq.

foundation, taking their ideas not from ancient practices and time-ballowed customs, but from a consideration of the abstract rights of man and the fundamental principles of civil society. Now these had formed the subjects of Rousseau's political works, and he had treated them in a manner very congenial to the French taste. His views contained much novelty, and even an agreeable dash of paradox, united with sentiment; they were conveyed in a perspicuous and admirable style; above all, they were enforced with a show of rigorous logical deduction. It was the union of these apparently opposite qualities that seems to have rendered Rousseau's speculations so popular in France.

If we examine Rousseau's treatises on social science, we shall find that they are far from being consistent. It is well known that he established his literary reputation by his answers to two theses proposed by the Academy of Dijon for prize essays. The first subject was: "Whether the progress of Literature and Art has contributed to purify or to corrupt manners?" the second, "What is the origin of the inequality among mankind? and is it authorised by the law of nature?"

In his answers to these questions Rousseau maintained that letters and the arts are a source of corruption; that civil society is an unnatural state of existence; that the development of the higher faculties is prejudicial to mankind; that a rude, contented sort of animal life, without any care for mental culture, is the proper and normal condition of man, and that every deviation from it is degeneracy. From this view it follows, that the institution of property, the source of inequality, was a crime, because property is a necessary condition of that abnormal state called civilised life. "The first man who, having enclosed a piece of land, undertook to say—this belongs to me—and found people simple enough to believe him, was the true founder of civil society."

But in Rousseau's *Contrat Social* we find the very basis of these earlier publications entirely thrown aside. Instead of rejecting civil society, the *Social Contract* is an elaborate attempt to construct a system of it; and the right of property is expressly recognised in the problem whose resolution is proposed as the very foundation of his system. "To find a form of association which shall defend and protect with all the force of the community the person *and the property* of each associate; and by which each, uniting himself to all, shall nevertheless obey only himself, and remain as free as he was before.[32]

Rousseau, then, was not always consistent—was he always

[32] *Contrat Social*, liv. i. chap. vi.

sincere? This point has been a subject of much dispute. He himself represents the paradoxes of his first essay as the offspring of a sudden inspiration.[33] Diderot, however, used to relate that, when a prisoner at Vincennes, Rousseau, who often visited him there, mentioned one day his intention of competing for the prize of the Dijon Academy, and being asked which side he meant to take, replied that he should maintain the affirmative of the question; that is, the purifying effect of literature. "It is the ass's bridge," observed Diderot; "all the mediocre talents will take that road, which affords only commonplace ideas; while the opposite side presents a new and fertile field of philosophy and eloquence." After a moment's reflection, Rousseau assented, and said that he would adopt the advice."[34]

The truth of this anecdote has been disputed by some eminent writers, from whose opinion we venture to differ only with the greatest diffidence,[35] and it is true enough that from Rousseau's cast of mind, the paradoxical conception might easily have been original. The evidence of Diderot is, however, confirmed by that of Hume. Burke, in his *Reflections on the French Revolution*, says: "Mr. Hume told me that he had from Rousseau himself the secret of his principles of composition. That acute, though eccentric, observer had perceived that to strike and interest the public, the marvellous must be produced; that the marvellous of the heathen mythology had long since lost its effect—that it was necessary to resort to the marvellous in life, manners, character and situation."

It is a question between Rousseau's good faith and his sagacity. Sincere or not, however, he was indisputably inconsistent. Yet many of the French democrats, and even some writers of the present day, have confounded together all his principles, as if they formed part of some great philosophical whole. The socialist doctrines of property in common, of fraternity as opposed to what M. L. Blanc calls *individualism*, must be sought in Rousseau's earlier works; they form no part of his *Social Contract*.[36] This last, his most practical work, and on which his fame as a political philosopher must rest, has been often misunderstood. It contains much that might be practicable, we do not say expedient, under certain conditions of society. It was so regarded not only by the French democrats, but also by the Corsicans and the Poles, who made Rousseau their legislator, and asked for a constitution at his

[33] See his *Confessions*, liv. viii.
[34] Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. ii. p. 40.
[35] See Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 67 note; Villemain, *Tableau, &c.*, t. ii. leçon xxiv.
[36] See L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.*, t. i. p. 535 and *passim*.

hands. The assumption of an original contract as the basis of civil society, the fundamental idea of the work, had been made by less eccentric philosophers than Rousseau; it had even been solemnly asserted by the practical English statesmen of 1688. If a fiction, it afforded at least convenient grounds for inquiring into first principles. Even the chief characteristic doctrine of the *Social Contract*, the sovereignty of the people, had been promulgated by the Dutch in their Declaration of Independence; it had been maintained by Locke in his *Treatise on Government*; nor in so far that the last appeal in all questions affecting the vital interests of a nation should be to the people itself, will any enlightened mind be disposed to contest the doctrine. But the difference between Locke and Rousseau is this, that while both thought that the sovereign power resides inalienably in the people, Locke allows that it may be delegated; while Rousseau holds, that the sovereign, that is, the people, can only be represented by itself.[37] Even this might not be impracticable in a small state; but Rousseau is forced to admit its unsuitableness for a large one;[38] and hence his theory sinks at once from the rank of absolute to that of only relative truth. And, as we shall see in the course of the following narrative, the active assumption of the sovereignty by the French people, or rather by the people of Paris, during the Revolution, and their utter contempt for their representatives, gave birth to some of its most absurd and atrocious scenes.

As a legitimate deduction from these views, Rousseau condemned representative government altogether. He recognised not such bodies as Parliaments and National Assemblies; for as the people cannot delegate the sovereignty, so neither can they delegate the legislative power, the highest function of the sovereign. Hence Rousseau was no admirer of the English constitution. He even ridicules the English for thinking themselves free; a condition which, according to him, they enjoy only during the short period employed in electing members of Parliament.[39]

The fundamental problem to be solved by the *Contrat Social*

[37] "Je dis donc, que la souveraineté, n'étant que l'exercise de la volonté générale, ne peut jamais s'aliéner, et que le souverain, qui est un être collectif, ne peut être representé que par lui-même." *Contr. Soc.*, liv. ii. chap. i.

[38] *Ibid.* liv. iii. chap. xv. Rousseau, however, had a plan for obviating this difficulty, which he intrusted to the Count d'Antraigues, afterwards a deputy in the Constituent Assembly; who, by the advice of a friend, destroyed the MS., as dangerous to royal authority. See *Œuvres de Rousseau*, t. v. p. 269 (ed. 1823).

[39] *Contrat Soc.*, liv. iii. chap. xv. Subsequently, however, he somewhat modified these views. Thus, in the *Considérations sur le Gouvernement de la Pologne*, chap. vii., he admits representative government. Cf. *Lettres de la Montagne*. But he thought that the English system required annual parliaments and universal suffrage.

has been already given.[40] Protection to person and property is, or ought to be, the object of every form of civil government. The only novelty of Rousseau's theory is, that each citizen in uniting himself with the rest, should still obey only himself, and remain as free as before. We might here inquire what freedom he had before? and whether any true freedom can really be enjoyed except in a state of civil society? But, passing over these questions, we will inquire only how, under any possible political system, a man can be said to obey himself alone. The groundwork of all civil society, the necessary condition of its existence, is the submission of individual will to that of the majority. But Rousseau is too proud to acknowledge this, though he can escape the conclusion only by a miserable sophism. "When," he says, "a law is proposed in the assembly of the people, what is asked of them is not precisely whether they approve or reject the proposition, but whether it is conformable to the general will, which is their will. . . . When, therefore the opinion contrary to mine carries the day, this only proves that I was deceived, and that what I took to be the general will was not so. If my particular opinion had prevailed, I should have done something else than what I willed, and it is then that I should not have been free!"[41]

But how could his particular opinion have prevailed unless it had been the will of the majority? And, unless a man may hold an opinion against his will, how can his will be always the same as the general will, though his opinion may be sometimes contrary to it? All this is a mere evasion of the acknowledgment that a man must obey the majority. Was it worth while to resort to such subterfuges to persuade every individual, that, though he has been out-voted, he is still the one millionth or the one twenty-millionth, part of a sovereign? Yet such were the sophisms which prevailed with the men of the Revolution.

It is a juggle upon the terms *will* and *opinion*. Rousseau does not venture to affirm, in plain terms, that all men may be made to have the same opinion, but he assumes that they may be made to have the same will. Let us see how this unanimity has been obtained. His Republic begins with proscribing all difference of opinion. Certain abstract principles, called "sentiments of sociability," must be assented to by every citizen; nay, must be subscribed as articles of religious faith! Those who decline to do

[40] See above, p. 24. We here subjoin the original French: "Trouver une forme d'association qui défende et protège de toute la force commune la personne et les biens de chaque associé, et par laquelle chacun, s'unissant à tous, n'obéisse pourtant qu'à lui-même, et reste aussi libre qu'auparavant." Liv. i. chap. vi.

[41] *Contrat Soc.*, liv. iv. chap. ii.

so must leave the country, those who after subscription act contrary to these principles are to be punished with death![42] This system involves the confession that it is impossible to make men think alike, and consequently to will alike, without the use of violence. When some are banished, others killed, those left at home, or alive, may be of one mind. The very system of the Reign of Terror!

Nor is Rousseau more consistent in his notions about *equality*, a doctrine which played so great a part in the Revolution. At the end of the first book of the *Social Contract* we read: "I shall conclude this chapter and book with a remark which should serve as the basis of the whole social system; it is, that the fundamental contract, instead of destroying *natural equality*, substitutes on the contrary a moral and lawful equality for whatever physical inequality nature may have established among men; and while they may be unequal in strength and genius, makes them all equal by convention and right."

But, as it may be presumed that in the supposed state of nature men obey no law but their own will, and as it is admitted that they are unequal in strength and genius, how should there be any *natural equality*? The end of civil society, then, is not to preserve the natural equality, for there is none; but to remedy the want of it, so far as may be done. This, as Rousseau truly says, is effected by convention and right. The result, however, is not *equality* but *justice*. All that society can do is to make men equal *before the law*.

Another inconsistency in Rousseau is, that he has at bottom but a very mean opinion of the sovereign he has set up. He is, after all, unwilling to intrust the people with their highest prerogative, that of legislation, although he has before informed us that it cannot possibly be delegated. "How," he says, "can a blind multitude which often knows not what it wishes, since it rarely knows what is good for it, execute so great and difficult a task as a system of legislation?" Again: "But there are a thousand sorts of ideas which it is impossible to translate into the language of the people. Views too general, objects too remote, are alike beyond its reach; every individual relishing only that plan of government which concerns his private interest, perceives with difficulty the advantages which he may derive from the continual privations imposed by good laws," &c.[43] Hence Rousseau is compelled to appoint a legislator.

In like manner he considers an aristocracy to be the best form of government, or of the *executive power*; which we must not

[42] *Contrat Soc.*, liv. iv. ch. viii. [43] *Contrat Soc.*, liv. ii. ch. vi. and vii.

confound with the *sovereignty*. He even thinks that there can be no perfect popular government without slavery. "The Greek people," he observes, "lived in a mild climate; it was not avaricious; its work was done by slaves; its chief business was its liberty. Having no longer the same advantages, how shall we preserve the same rights? . . . What! can liberty only be maintained through servitude? Perhaps even so. The two extremes meet. . . As for you, people of modern times, you have no slaves, but you are slaves yourselves instead; you buy their liberty at the price of your own. It is in vain that you boast this preference; I see in it more of cowardice than humanity."[44] He deprecates, indeed, being considered as the advocate of slavery, though, after what he has said, we hardly see on what grounds. But the fact remains, that he thinks there can hardly be a good government without a certain aristocratic mixture; for what is a people whose work is done for them by slaves but an aristocratic people?

These few specimens may serve to show that Rousseau was not always consistent with himself, and it is certain that his doctrines were often misunderstood, exaggerated, and misapplied by his revolutionary disciples.[45] Yet no writer, as we have before remarked, had a greater influence on the Revolution. The majority even of the first National Assembly were his disciples, as appears from their voting him a statue, as the author of the *Contrat Social*, the elementary book of public liberty and the science of government; and from their giving a pension of 1200 francs to his widow.[46] They seem to have borrowed from Rousseau the idea of giving the King the title of "King of the French," instead of "King of France."[47] But the Declaration of the Rights of Man is perhaps the strongest instance of Rousseau's influence on the Constituent Assembly. In the third Article his dogma of the sovereignty of the people is laid down in its full extent. As the Revolution pursued its headlong course, Rousseau's authority grew all the stronger. The first Declaration of Rights only proclaimed that men are equal *in rights*; the second (June 24th 1793) asserted that they are equal *by nature*.[48] Thus the natural was sophistically confounded with the social state, the savage with the civilised man; and the people, instead of being instructed in their duties, were taught to believe themselves entitled to rights utterly incompatible with their condition.

[44] *Contr. Soc.*, liv. iii. ch. xv.

[45] See to this effect the testimony of Bailleul, a member of the Convention, *Esprit de la Révol.*, chap. vi.

[46] Toulongeon, *Hist. de France, &c.*, t. i. p. 266.

[47] See *Contrat Soc.*, liv. i. chap. ix.

[48] See these Declarations in Toulongeon, t. i. App.

As Voltaire was the laughing philosopher, the Democritus of the Revolution, so Rousseau was its Heraclitus. Uniting an ardent imagination and a morbid sensibility bordering on madness with extraordinary dialectic subtlety, he was enabled to support his extravagant hypotheses with a force of reasoning which to some minds made them appear truths. But we do not believe that he was the dupe of his own paradoxes. He threw them out as baits for the vulgar and unreflecting. He would perhaps have been filled with regret could he have foreseen their consequences, for he had the greatest aversion to violence. In one of his letters he observes: "In my opinion, the blood of one man alone is more precious than the liberty of the whole human race;"[49] where, however, his temperament led him to a wrong conclusion.

A morbid sensibility, like that of Rousseau, is, however, so far from being incompatible with the most atrocious cruelty that their union forms one of the strangest and most striking features of the French Revolution. M. Michelet has remarked that many of the terrorists "were men of an exalted and morbid sensibility;"[50] and he goes on to observe that artists—not we suspect of the highest order—and women were particularly subject to it. Thus Panis and Sergent, the bloodthirsty miscreants who took so active a part in the massacres of September, burst into tears because a Marseillese to whom they had refused ball-cartridges on August 10th, threatened to shoot himself.[51] Jourdan *coup-tête*, who cut off the heads of the governors of the Bastille and of the *gardes du corps* at Versailles, and afterwards took a leading part in the atrocities at Avignon, was easily moved to tears, and would sometimes cry like a child.[52] The perpetrators of the September massacres were occasionally seized with a fit of frantic joy when one of their intended victims was acquitted, and, by "a strange reaction of sensibility," would shed tears and throw themselves into the arms of those whom a moment before they were about to slay.[53] The same sort of "sensibility" appears to have characterised Danton.[54] It has been remarked that the novels and other publications of the bloodiest period of the Revolution are full of the word *sensibility*. Fabre d'Eglantine even talked about "the sensibility of Marat." But this expression, as M. Michelet observes, will surprise nobody but those who confound sensibility with goodness. In fact this

[49] Lettre à Madame * * *, Sept. 7th 1776.

[50] *Hist. de la Révol. Franç.*, liv. ii. chap. ii.

[51] See Panis's speech in Buchez and Roux, *Hist. Parlementaire*, t. xix. p. 94.

[52] Michelet, t. iii. p. 295.

[53] *Ibid.* t. iv. p. 158.

[54] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.*, t. viii p. 97.

sort of feeling is so little connected either with the head or heart that it might almost be displayed by a galvanised corpse.

In the absence of all public debate, literature was, under the old *régime*, the only channel of political discussion. The growing audacity of its tone had not escaped the attention of the Government. A Royal Declaration of 1757, in the very zenith of Voltaire's ascendant, condemns *to death* those who should write or print or disseminate anything hostile to religion or the established government.[55] The censorship of the press, however, which was in the hands of the clergy, was on the whole exercised with tolerable leniency, though often capriciously. Thus Rousseau's prize essay was left unnoticed, while his harmless *Emile* was condemned to be burnt by the executioner. In like manner the Sorbonne refused their *imprimatur* to Marmontel's innocuous *Belisaire*, and extracted from it thirty-two propositions, which they published with their anathema as heretical, under the title of *Indiculus*; to which Turgot subjoined the epithet *ridiculus*. One of the propositions denounced was: "It is not by the light of the flaming pile that souls are to be enlightened;" whence Turgot drew the logical conclusion that, in the opinion of the Sorbonne, souls were to be so enlightened! Such were the clerical censors of those days.

A living French writer somewhat paradoxically maintains that the restrictions on literature were really effective, and that the *philosophers* had thus little or no influence in producing the Revolution. In corroboration of this view he asserts, on the authority of the Introduction to the *Moniteur*, that their works were to be found only in the libraries of the educated and rich.[56] But what more could be required? It is notorious that the Revolution was begun by the higher classes. Thus Marmontel tells us that among the nobles, a considerable number of enthusiasts (*têtes exaltées*), some from a spirit of liberty, others from calculating and ambitious views, were inclined towards the popular party.[57] Madame de Staël says that not only all the men but also all the women, who had any influence upon opinion among the higher classes, were warm in favour of the national cause; that fashion, all powerful in France, ran in this direction; and that this state of things was the result of the whole century.[58] We need hardly advert to the rapidity with which in a country like France, opinion spreads from class to class. This circumstance had not escaped the notice of

[55] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 100.
[56] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes de la Révol. Fr.*, t. i. p. 51 sq.
[57] *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 104.
[58] *Considérations sur la Révol. Fr. Œuvres*, t. xii. p. 179.

Voltaire.[59] In fact the persecution which authors experienced was more vexatious than terrible, and calculated rather to excite than to deter. Hume even expressed to Diderot his opinion that French intolerance was more favourable to intellectual progress than the unlimited liberty of the press enjoyed in England.[60] However this may be, it is certain, and may serve as another refutation of M. Granier de Cassagnac's theory, that the progress of public opinion in France had led acute observers to predict a revolution even so early as the middle of the eighteenth century. Lord Chesterfield, in a letter dated April 13th 1752, adverting to the quarrel between Louis XV. and the Parliament of Paris observes: "This, I see, that before the end of this century, the trade of both King and priest will not be half so good a one as it has been. Du Clos, in his *Reflections*, hath observed, and very truly, 'qu'il y a un germe de raison qui commence à se developper en France.' A development that must prove fatal to regal and papal pretensions."[61]

While such was the progress of public opinion, the monarchy was retrograding into unpopularity, we might almost say into contempt. The French people, till towards the close of Louis XIV.'s reign, had loved their kings with an affection bordering on idolatry. They looked up to them as their protectors against the aristocracy, and as the promoters of national glory, both in arms and letters. But this popularity began to wane with Louis XIV.'s good fortune, and the approach of that misery which his ambition had occasioned. The regency of the Duke of Orléans was calculated to bring all government into contempt. Yet the loyalty of the French seemed to revive a little in the first part of Louis XV.'s reign, till his mean and abominable vices entirely extinguished it. Such was the natural fate of the lover of Madame Du Barri, of the hoary and hypocritical voluptuary of the *Parc aux Cerfs*, of the mean and avaricious speculator in the distress of his people. The King and the corn-dealer were for ever confounded, and consigned to everlasting infamy. Frequent scarcities constantly recalled the *Pacte de Famine*, till at length it resounded as the death-knell of the French monarchy, when on the 6th of October 1789, the populace led the royal family captive to Paris, with shouts that they were bringing the baker, his wife, and the little apprentice!

[59] "La lumière s'est tellement répandue *de proche en proche*, qu'on éclatera à la première occasion," &c. *Lettre* à M. Chauvelin, Avr. 22 1764.

[60] Tocqueville, *Anc. Régime*, p. 233.

[61] See to the same effect another letter of December 25th 1753. The French Revolution was also foretold by Leibnitz in his *New Essay on the Human Understanding*, B. iv. ch. xvi.; by Voltaire, in the letter to M. Chauvelin, already quoted; and by Rousseau in his *Emile*, t. ii. p. 99. (ed. Geneva, 1780).

Thus Louis XVI. inherited a crown sullied by the vices of his predecessors, and became the innocent victim of faults that were not his own. The feebleness of his character, nay, even his very virtues, assisted the Revolution. Had he possessed more energy and decision, had he felt less reluctance to shed the blood of his subjects, he might probably have averted the excesses which marked his own end and that of the monarchy. "It is frightful to think," says Mounier, "that with a less benevolent soul, another prince might perhaps have found means to maintain his power."[62]

The aid which, against his better judgment, Louis XVI. was induced to lend to the American rebellion, must, no doubt, be reckoned among the causes of his fall; not only by aggravating the financial distress, but also, and more materially, from the support which the doctrines of the revolutionary philosophers derived from the establishment of the American Republic. While, as M. Tocqueville remarks,[63] to the rest of Europe the American rebellion was only a new and astonishing fact, to the French people it rendered more sensible and striking what they thought that they knew already. The Americans seemed only to be executing what the French writers had conceived, and to be giving to their dreams all the substance of reality. The aid which the French Government lent to rebels appeared a sanction of revolt. Lafayette and other Frenchmen, who had taken a personal share in the American struggle, were among the foremost to promote the Revolution in France, and the enthusiastic feeling which the declaration of American Independence excited among the French, was perhaps heightened by the circumstance that it had been achieved at the expense of a rival nation. During the first tumults in Paris, the name of Washington was the principal watchword in the different sections.

Louis XVI. himself, in his speech on opening the States-General in 1789, attributed the financial pressure to the American war. Its cost was estimated at 1194 million livres, or about 48 millions sterling; and so bad was the state of credit in France, that this money was borrowed at an average of about 10 per cent.[64] We cannot, however, regard the disordered state of the finances as much more than the *occasion* of the Revolution, by necessitating the convocation of the States-General. It was none of the essential *causes* of the outbreak. Preceding monarchs had triumphed over greater financial embarrassments; and had everything else in the

[62] *Recherches sur les Causes, &c.*
[63] *Anc. Régime*, p. 223.
[64] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. i. p. 108 note.

State been sound, even a national bankruptcy might have been surmounted. In fact, though the *deficit* set the Revolution in motion, it occupied but little attention after the movement was once begun.

The importance of the *deficit* as a revolutionary agent, arose not so much from its amount, as from the temper of the nation. The wide-spread discontent among the middling and lower classes forbade the imposition of any new taxes, while the higher orders were not inclined to relinquish their fiscal privileges after a career of financial extravagance. Calonne, though the minister of the courtiers, was compelled to acknowledge that the only hope of safety lay in the reform of all that was vicious in the State. He proposed to abolish the exemption from taxation enjoyed by the clergy and nobles; to increase the product of the direct taxes by a more equal distribution of them, and that of the indirect taxes by releasing agriculture, commerce, and manufactures from their fetters; by abolishing internal barriers, obsolete rights and privileges, &c.; in short, by adopting many of the plans of D'Argenson already mentioned, including the establishment of provincial councils. These plans, as we have seen, he was unable to carry out, but from this time any ministry but a reforming one became impossible. Thus M. De Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, Calonne's successor, besides adopting many of the financial schemes of that minister, proposed to reform the whole administration of justice, both the civil and criminal; busied himself with amending the system of education, and abolished Protestant disabilities by the edict of Nov. 19th 1787. Brienne was succeeded by Necker, who, as a Protestant and a Swiss, naturally carried his views still further. He counselled the admission of all citizens, without distinction, to public employments, the abolishment of *lettres de cachet*, and of the censorship of the press; and at a later period he showed that he was not disinclined to alter and modify the monarchy itself. These reforms seem substantial enough, and would perhaps have given France all that she required, short of a constitution. But they involved an attack upon all the privileged classes and constituted powers; they threatened provincial administration, commercial customs, and the privileges not only of the clergy and nobles, but also of the *robe* or legal order, and in some degree of the *bourgeoisie*. Hence they provoked the opposition of these classes; and it soon became evident that this opposition could be overcome only by assembling the States-General.

The cry for this assembly had indeed originated in the Parliament of Paris (July 1787), but rather with the design of thwarting

the Court than helping the people. The Parliament was popular, because it was the opponent of the Crown, and it consequently expected that the States would sanction all its pretensions. When it was restored to its functions in Sept. 1788, after its suspension for having opposed the judicial reforms of Brienne, it was fêted by the people with extravagant demonstrations of joy. But in a few days it lost all its popularity by enregistering the royal declaration for the summoning of the States, with the clause that they should be convened and composed agreeably to the forms observed in 1614; a clause which frustrated the popular wish that the *tiers état* should be represented by deputies equal in number to both the other orders combined.

This last point, the doubling of the *tiers état*, was one of the most important immediate causes of the Revolution. It gave the movement a beginning. Necker's conduct in the matter, though perhaps only the result of a want of firmness, and of broad statesmanlike views, was so equivocal, that some have accused him of premeditated treachery.[65] It will be recollected[66] that he caused the Notables to be summoned a second time, in order to decide this question; yet though they refused their sanction to the measure, Necker persuaded the King to adopt it. To judge his conduct fairly, we must recollect the circumstances in which he was placed. Except that the Notables had vaguely allowed, on their second convocation, that the taxes should be borne by all Frenchmen, the privileged orders were obstinately opposed to all concession. Yet it was absolutely necessary to overcome this opposition; and the only method of doing so was to appeal to the people, and to give them a preponderating voice in the Assembly. But Necker's conduct was hardly straightforward. In a report to the King on the subject, he pretended to think that the importance of the question was exaggerated, since by ancient customs the three estates were authorised to deliberate and vote separately, and thus the respective numbers of the different Chambers would be of no moment. Yet the very next sentence shows that he was at least contemplating the occasional union of the States in one chamber "for the examination of all such matters in which their interest is absolutely equal or alike."[67] Necker induced the Parliament, through D'Eprémesnil, to reverse, or rather to explain, their decree on this subject; and they declared, Dec. 5th, that

[65] See Sallier, *Annales Françaises*, p. 269 sqq.; Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t ii. p. 385 sqq.

[66] See Vol. III. p. 546.

[67] See the Report in the *Introd. au Moniteur*, p. 500 sqq., ap. Martin, t. xvi. p. 621.

by "the forms of 1614," they meant only the summoning by bailliages and *sénéchaussés*; and they left the decision as to the number of the deputies to the wisdom of the King. But by this tardy recantation, though accompanied with a recommendation of other popular measures, they failed to regain the good will of the people, and succeeded only in alienating the privileged orders. The doubling of the *tiers état* was announced in the royal declaration entitled *Résultat du Conseil du Roi tenu à Versailles*, Dec. 27th 1788.

The question with the Court was, how to tide over the present conjuncture, and to retain as much as possible of its former power. The question with the people was, how to obtain their due share in the government; in short, a constitution. Necker's vacillating policy and attempts to compromise matters tended only to precipitate the crisis. In his speech on the opening of the Assembly, he suggested that on certain occasions at least, the three orders should deliberate and vote in common; and he adduced some arguments to dissuade them from adopting such a method as a general rule.[68] If they did not, indeed, deliberate in common on matters of finance, Necker would not have obtained his end, his object being to force the privileged orders to pay taxes. But it betrays a lamentable want of statesmanship and knowledge of human nature not to have perceived that the Commons, having once obtained a union of the Chambers, would never abandon it; and that such a union would necessarily lead to a revolution. Necker's character as a statesman cannot be cleared from this reproach except on the assumption that he foresaw and wilfully incurred the consequences of his policy. For ourselves, we are inclined to adopt the views of a recent historian of this period:[69] that Necker was in this conjuncture too much the mere minister of finance; that in his anxiety to fill up the *deficit*, he overlooked the fatal results with which his measures for that purpose might be attended; that he had conceived too high an opinion of the moderation of the people, and perhaps it may be added of his own ability to control and direct their conduct. However this may be, it is certain that Necker's policy was one of the chief proximate causes of the Revolution, which was thus mainly owing to two natives of Geneva, one of whom supplied its ideas, and the other the means of putting them into execution. But, for this result,

[68] See his speech in Toulongeon, t. i. App. p. 43 sqq.

[69] See Sir A. Alison's *Hist. of Europe*, ch. iii. § 144, ch. iv. § 10. Such also was the opinion of Capello, the Venetian ambassador at Paris at that period. See his report to the Venetian Senate in Daru (liv. xxxiv.), which contains an excellent view of the causes of the French Revolution.

the classes that suffered most from its effects had only themselves to blame. They brought their calamities on themselves by the tenacity with which they clung to their unjust, absurd, and antiquated privileges, and by the obstinacy with which they opposed even the most necessary and moderate reforms.

The Court must also share in the condemnation of the minister. It could not have been ignorant of the state of public opinion. Five princes of the blood, the Count d'Artois, the three Condés, and the Prince de Conti, in a memorial addressed to the King in December 1788, had declared that a revolution was in progress. The state of the public mind must also have been known from the various publications and pamphlets of the day, and especially from the *cahiers*, or papers of instructions, given by the electors to their deputies. The Court committed a fatal mistake in doing too much and too little. It awakened the just hopes of the people by allowing the *tiers état* to equal the numbers of the other two orders; and then attempted to frustrate these hopes by the royal session of June 23rd. At a later period, Necker, in his work on the Revolution, regretted that the union of the three orders had not been conceded with good grace and at once. It will indeed appear in the following narrative that the conduct of the Court throughout the Revolution was a series of blunders.

The centralisation of all France in Paris, rendering it as it were the sensorium of the kingdom, contributed much to the origin as well as to the peculiar character of the Revolution. Hence had proceeded the ideas which gave it birth; here took place all the scenes which decided its course. From the very first moment the fate of the Revolution was in the hands of the Parisian mob, and of the demagogues who led it. The destruction of Reveillon's paper manufactory by the populace, during the election of deputies to the States, though too much stress has perhaps been laid upon it as a political movement,[71] showed at least what extensive elements of discontent and danger were lurking in Paris. No sooner was the Assembly opened than the Parisian electors, having formed themselves into a permanent and illegal committee, began to dictate to it. The deputies were regarded as the mere servants and organs of the sovereign people, and were bullied and insulted by the mob that filled the tribunes; who, as Arthur Young tells us, interrupted the debates by clapping their hands, and other noisy expressions of approbation.[72] The right of petition began

[70] See Martin, *Hist. de France*, t. xvi. p. 619.

[71] On this subject see Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. i. p. 11 sqq.

[72] While the deputies were discussing the subject of constituting themselves into a National Assembly, a man rushed from the tribunes and collared Malouet for uttering some exclamations which he disapproved. Droz, ap. Michelet, t. i. p. 43.

very early to be abused. Sometimes these petitions were only ludicrous and unseemly. During the Constituent Assembly they were chiefly of a sentimental character. Thus the Assembly heard "with admiration" the address of a citizen who had sent a nosegay composed of ears of corn mingled with pomegranates gathered by the hands of his spouse.[73] Under the legislative, the petitioners were often accompanied by a band which played symphonies and marches. On the 20th of June 1792, they danced several hours before the Assembly. Under the Convention, petitioners became still more extravagant and menacing. They obtained permission to sing popular songs and romances at the bar;[74] they often came armed; they dictated to the deputies in the most insolent manner, and sometimes threatened their lives. When the party of the Gironde at length began to feel the intolerable tyranny of the mob which they had themselves used to promote their ends, they sought to protect themselves and to secure the freedom of debate by moving for a guard to be composed of provincials. The manner in which this project was denounced by the orator of the Paris Sections affords a good specimen of the later style of petitioning. "Proxies of the Sovereign," he exclaimed, "you see before you the deputies of the Sections of Paris. They are come to tell you eternal truths, to recall to you the principles which nature and reason have engraved upon the heart of every freeman. A proposition has been made to put you on a level with tyrants, by surrounding you with a separate guard, different from that which composes the public force. The Sections, after duly weighing the principles in which the sovereignty of the people resides, declare to you through us that they find the project odious, and dangerous in execution. . . . Far be from us all egotism. We are not defending here the interests of Paris, but those of the whole Republic. . . . People say, Paris wants to isolate itself. Insulting calumny, absurd pretext! Paris has made the Revolution; Paris has given liberty to France; Paris will know how to maintain it!"[75]

Such was the self-constituted sovereign people of the Revolution —the dregs of a large and profligate city. How unlike the sovereign dreamt of by the Genevese philosopher! Nay, how unlike the great mass of the French nation, who were desirous only of a moderate social reform. "The labourer in the fields," says Marmontel,[76] the artisan in the towns, the honest burgess engrossed

[73] *Moniteur*, t. i. p. 336, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 442.

[74] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 343.

[75] *Hist. Parl.*, t. xix. p. 350 sq.

[76] *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 37 sq.

by his trade, demanded only to be relieved, and had they been left alone, would have sent to the Assembly deputies as peaceable as themselves. But in the towns, and especially in Paris, there exists a class of men, who, though distinguished by their education, belong by birth to the people, make common cause with them, and, when their rights are in question, take up their interests, lend them their intelligence, and infect them with their passions. It was among this class that an innovating, bold, and contentious spirit had long been forming itself, and was every day acquiring more strength and influence."

But, while the ascendancy of the Parisian rabble effected the speedy downfall of the monarchy, it was also the principal cause of the failure of the republic. The throne was no sooner overturned than its overthrowers, instead of consolidating the new state, began among themselves a deadly struggle for power, a struggle of which the mob were still the arbiters. How this state of things soon found its natural termination in a military despotism will appear in the following narrative.

The character of the national representatives was another cause of the failure of the Revolution. From the want of all public life in France, they had no political experience. Their knowledge of politics rested entirely on theory and speculation; and thus, as M. Tocqueville observes,[77] they carried their literary habits into their proceedings. Hence a love of general theories, complete systems of legislation, exact but impracticable symmetry in the laws; a contempt for existing facts, and a taste for what was original, ingenious and new; a desire to reconstruct the state after a uniform plan, instead of trying to amend the parts of it. To this political ignorance, or worse still, illusory knowledge, must be ascribed some of the greatest evils of the Revolution. Vague and undefined notions of liberty and equality produced the worst and most ridiculous excesses. As it was impossible to establish an equality by raising up the lower orders, it was determined to pull down the higher ones, and thus to reduce everything to a uniform low level. Polite manners were exchanged for the grossness of the least educated class. The rich dissembled their enjoyments, and hid their pride under a modest, not to say miserable, exterior; even wit itself, as something above the vulgar level, was compelled to assume the *carmagnole*.[78] As the bounds of the liberty aimed at were undefined, so they were never thought to be attained; and the entering thus on an unknown course necessarily inflamed

[77] *Anc. Régime*, p. 224 sq. [78] Bailleul, *Esprit de la Révol.*, ch. viii.

and exaggerated all passions and opinions. This is no sketch from fancy, but the confessions of an actor in those scenes, a republican and a member of the Convention.[79] "We were but weak creatures," he says, "abandoned to ourselves, and scarcely knowing how to profit by the errors of the preceding day. We could only advance through a thousand obstacles, a thousand dangers, and thus from mistake to mistake, from catastrophe to catastrophe, from overthrow to overthrow, painfully arrive at the grand result desired by all, but which no individual wisdom could assure to us beforehand."

The literary character of the Revolution was thus the cause of many of its mistakes and follies, and perhaps of some of its atrocities. As the English Puritans assumed scriptural names, and set up as their example the scenes of the Old Testament, so many of the French demagogues imagined that they were emulating Brutus and other heroes of Roman story. The members of the Convention talked familiarly of poignarding one another; and it is possible that the memory of the proscriptions of Sulla and the Triumvirs may not have been without some influence on the massacres of the Revolution. M. Villemain attributes this affectation of antiquity to the influence of Rousseau.[80] Another cause perhaps was, that the French, finding no example of patriotism in their own annals, were obliged to recur to those of ancient times. This pedantry of patriotism seems to have been more especially characteristic of the Girondists. In the time of the Directory fêtes were given, in which ancient chariots were introduced, and the guests appeared in Greek costumes.[81] When Bonaparte made the Peace of Tolentino, and stipulated for the delivery of Roman statues and other works of art, he wrote to the Directory: "I have particularly insisted on the busts of Junius and Marcus Brutus, which shall be the first sent to Paris." The five Directors, at their reception of Bonaparte at the Luxembourg in 1797, appeared in Roman dresses; while he himself, who no doubt laughed at them in his sleeve, was very plainly attired.[82]

But we must remember, after all, that the French had a good cause, and though the crimes and follies with which they disgraced it, prevent us from looking on their struggles for liberty with the same unmixed satisfaction with which we regard those of other great nations, yet we must not suffer ourselves to be diverted from

[79] *Idem, Examen crit. de l'ouvrage de Mdme. de Staël*, t. i. p. 129.

[80] "C'est lui (Rousseau), et non pas l'éducation des collèges, comme on l'a dit, qui avait créé cet enthousiasme de l'antiquité, fécond en parodies et en crimes." Leçon xxii.

[81] Madame de Staël, *Considérations, &c.*, p. iii. ch. ix.

[82] *Ibid.* ch. xxiii. xxvi.

taking a calm and equitable view of their revolution by the disgust or contempt which many of its scenes inspire. We must recollect that they had many just grounds of provocation; that the state of France demanded not a mere political revolution, but the re-organisation of society from its very foundations; that such a change cannot suddenly be effected without inflicting for a time the severest social misery; that a reform begun under circumstances of violence is difficult, perhaps impossible, to be arrested at the point when it ceases to be any longer salutary; that the evils and calamities of the French Revolution must in great part be ascribed to the wretched government which rendered it inevitable. We must make allowance for a people oppressed and irritated by despotism, and accustomed to be guided and controlled in all their acts, who suddenly became their own masters, and who, from the arbitrary proceedings and *coups d'état* of the old *régime*, had ceased to feel any reverence for law and justice, had come to regard them as mere fictions. We must also allow for their new and unexampled situation, for the alarm and suspicion which it necessarily created. A vague fear of brigands, which nobody could define, a fear of famine, more real and tangible; a fear of treachery, of foreign plots, of Pitt and Coburg. The alarm was increased by sudden calls to arms, the sound of the *tocsin*, the strange dresses and emblems, the new magistracies and tribunals, the dislocation and disruption of all social life. Thus terror ruled uncontrolled, and terror is soon precipitated into deeds of cruelty.

Resemblances between the French and English Revolutions have been ingeniously pointed out, which at first sight seem striking enough. In both countries an unpopular queen; the Long Parliament in England, and the self-constituted National Assembly in France; the flight of Louis to Varennes, and of Charles to the Isle of Wight; the trial and execution of both those monarchs; the government by the Parliament, and the government by the Convention; Cromwell and Bonaparte, who expel these assemblies and rule by the sword; the setting aside of the heirs of these usurpers, and the restoration of the legitimate monarchs.[83] These resemblances, however, lie only on the surface. A deeper examination will discover that no two events can well be more opposite in their spirit and essential character than the French and English Revolutions. While the object of the one was to destroy, that of the other was to restore. In the Petition of Right, the English Parliament protested against certain of the King's acts which were the acknowledged prerogative of the French Monarch; such as

[83] See Croker's *Essays on the French Revolution*, p. 10.

the levying of taxes by his own authority, imprisoning his subjects and confiscating their property arbitrarily and without legal trial, billeting soldiers and mariners upon householders, &c. Against these abuses they appeal to the rights and liberties which they have *inherited* according to the laws and statutes of the realm, such as the Great Charters, statutes of Edward I., Edward III., &c.[84]

Such was the beginning of the English Revolution. But what was the course of the first National Assembly? After a long and splendid career in arts and arms, the most polished nation in Europe found it necessary to assume the position of Man just emerged from his primeval forests, and like the original societies imagined by Rousseau and other speculative politicians, to settle the elementary conditions of its civil state. Everything that had gone before was swept away, and a constitution was built up on paper from first principles as deduced from the supposed natural rights of Man. A practical statesman would refrain from enunciating these elementary principles, which, in fact, are little more than truisms, though it may be said that they had a peculiar significance in France, as showing the hatred towards the privileged classes, and indicating the levelling system that was to follow. Another striking difference is, that while in England the quarrel was in great part founded on disputes of religion, and fanaticism was a principal agent, in France religion was discarded altogether.

As the whole method and character of the two revolutions was diametrically opposed, so also was the conduct of the two Kings. Charles I. had violated the constitution by not calling a Parliament for a space of twelve years; Louis XVI., though bound by no law but his own will, assembled the *États généraux*, which had not been summoned for nearly two centuries; during the abeyance of the English Parliament, the Star Chamber had proceeded in the most absolute and illegal manner, while the French King, instead of increasing, considerably mitigated the arbitrary powers, such as the use of *lettres de cachet*, &c., which were at his disposal; Charles began a civil war and took up arms against his subjects; Louis could not be persuaded to shed the blood of his people, even in the most urgent cases of self-defence.

In judging the French Revolution from its effects, which, however, may still be said to be in progress, we must on the whole pronounce it to have been beneficial. It delivered France from an arbitrary and unbounded royal prerogative, from an intolerant

[84] The reader will find the characters of the French and English Revolutions very justly discriminated in Mr. Massey's *Reign of George III.*, vol. iv. ch. 33, p. 35 sqq.

church and a tyrannical feudal nobility; and it welded the previously ill-cemented provinces into one compact and powerful body; in short, into the French nation. It will hardly be disputed that France of the present day is an incomparably greater and more powerful state than it ever was under the ancient dynasty. But notwithstanding the vast effects of the French Revolution on the material condition of Europe, its moral influence does not appear to have been permanent. In the latter respect it is far behind the Reformation. Had the Revolution been successful, had it established a democratic republic or even a stable constitutional monarchy, its moral effects would have been incalculable. France would have become the model country of Europe and perhaps the foster-mother of a universal democracy; as it is, her example offers rather warning than encouragement. It may be remarked, for the credit of human nature, that the excesses of the French democrats were not imitated in those countries where their principles had produced a revolution. Neither massacres, nor incendiarism, nor sacrilege, nor proscriptions took place in Holland, the Netherlands, on the banks of the Rhine, in Switzerland, and Italy. It may too be observed as a singular fact that in foreign countries their absurd and abominable principles found readier acceptance among the higher classes of society than among the lower and more uneducated. In Germany the peasants of Suabia and the Palatinate were the chief opponents of the French Revolution, while the princes and states of the Empire made but a feeble resistance and ultimately took advantage of it to forward their own selfish interests. It was to the peasants of Northern Italy that the allies were considerably indebted for their rapid triumphs in 1799; it was the *lazzaroni* and peasants of Naples that defended the capital against the French, re-established the King, and drove the French from Rome. The same class of people in Piedmont displayed the greatest devotion to their sovereign, and often proved a serious impediment to the progress of the French arms.[85]

[85] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 257.

CHAPTER II.

The first acts of the French *tiers état*, or Commons, after constituting themselves a National Assembly,[1] were to declare the legislative power indivisible, and to annul all the existing taxes, on the ground that only those are lawful which have received the formal consent of the nation; but in order perhaps to obviate a dissolution of the Assembly, they decreed the continuance of the present taxes so long as their session should last. These vigorous proceedings filled the Court with dismay. To avert the danger, recourse was had to one of those false steps which ultimately caused the ruin of the monarchy. It was resolved that the King, in a royal session, should endeavour to restore a good understanding between the different orders, and to reduce their proceedings to some regularity. It was thought that, as in the ancient days of the monarchy, the Assembly might be overawed by the King's presence, and by a few words delivered in the accustomed tone of absolute authority. Such a step was in obvious contradiction to the very nature of the Assembly; for, if the King's voice was to prevail, to what purpose had he summoned the representatives of the people?

Necker must share the blame of this measure, though not of the manner in which it was executed. That minister still hoped to carry his favourite project of two Chambers, voting in common on general and financial matters, but separately in things that more particularly concerned the respective orders. His own scheme was not a very liberal one. Everything was to come from the King's concession. Necker drew up a royal address in a tone of mildness and conciliation, in which the vote *per capita* was placed first, and the less palatable part of the scheme in the sequel.[2] The Council, however, took the matter out of his hands, and altered his draft of the speech so materially, and, it must be allowed, so injudiciously, that Necker considered himself justified in absenting himself from the royal session.

[1] See Vol. III. p. 547.

[2] The address, as first proposed by Necker, will be found in the Appendix to Bertrand de Moleville's *Mémoires*.

The royal session, originally fixed for June 22nd, was postponed till the following day; meanwhile, the Assembly was adjourned, the hall where they sat was ordered to be closed, and the deputies who presented themselves were brutally repulsed. But the more turbulent leaders of the *tiers état*, particularly Bailly, assembled the larger part of that order in a neighbouring tennis-court; where the Abbé Sieyès, perceiving their excited state, proposed that they should at once transfer themselves to Paris, and proceed to make decrees in the name of the nation. It was to avert this step that Mounier proposed the celebrated oath that they should not separate till they had established a constitution.[3]

On the following day, the tennis-court having been hired by some of the princes, in order to prevent these meetings, the deputies repaired to the church of St. Louis. Here, to their great joy, and to the consternation of the Court, they were joined by the Archbishops of Bordeaux and Vienne, the Bishops of Chartres and Rhodez, and 145 representatives of the clergy, besides all the nobles of Dauphiné; in the states of which province it was customary for the three orders to sit together.

When the Chambers again assembled on June 23rd, the King undoubtedly made some important concessions, and such as, under other circumstances, might probably have been satisfactory. He abolished the *taille*, vested solely in the States-General the power of levying taxes, submitted the public accounts to their examination, did away with *corvées* and several other vexatious and oppressive grievances. But these concessions were made to spring from the royal grace and favour, and not from constitutional right, thus giving no security for their continuance. The clergy were to have a special *veto* in all questions of religion. The equality of imposts would be sanctioned only if the clergy and nobles consented to renounce their pecuniary privileges. The admission of *roturiers* to commands in the army was expressly refused. All that the *tiers état* had hitherto done was annulled. Above all, the King willed that the three orders should remain distinct, and deliberate separately; though, if they wished to unite, he would permit it for this session alone, and that only for affairs of a general nature; and he concluded by ordering the members to separate immediately, and to meet next morning, each in the chamber appropriated to his order. All this was conveyed in a tone of absolute authority,

[3] Such is the real history of this famous oath, according to Mallet du Pan, who appears to have had it from Mounier himself. See *Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. i. p. 165 note.

neither suitable to the present posture of affairs, nor to the natural temper of the King.[4]

The nobles and part of the clergy followed the King when he retired. But the Commons, by the mouth of Mirabeau, when summoned to leave the hall by M. de Brézé, the master of the ceremonies, refused to do so, unless expelled by military force; and they proceeded to confirm their previous resolutions, which the King had annulled, and to declare the persons of the deputies inviolable; thus showing their determination to maintain the sovereignty which they had usurped. In short, the attempted *coup d'état* had failed; while the applause with which Necker was everywhere greeted afforded a striking proof of the popular feeling. On the very same evening the King felt himself compelled to the humiliating step of requesting that minister to retain his portfolio; thus virtually condemning his own speech. Although some attempt had been made at military display, it was impossible to carry out by force the royal dictates so haughtily delivered; and the ministers had only succeeded in making the King to be disobeyed *in person*, and bringing his authority into contempt.

The consequences of this imprudent policy soon became apparent. On the day after the royal session, the majority of the clergy, composed of *curés*, who, from their constant intercourse with the people, were disposed to take the popular side, joined the Commons; and, on June 26th, the Bishops of Orange and Autun, and the Archbishop of Paris, did the same. The Bishop of Autun, Talleyrand Périgord, here gave the first proof of that unerring sagacity which, through all the eventful changes of the Revolution, enabled him to distinguish the winning side. The conduct of the Archbishop of Paris was the result of popular violence. A mob had stormed his palace, and, with threats of assassination, extorted his promise to join the Commons. The secession of the clergy was immediately followed by that of forty-seven of the nobles, chiefly the friends of Necker, and including the Duke of Orléans. The Court, alarmed by reports that extensive massacres were planning, that 100,000 rebels were in full march, and others of the like kind,[5] now deemed it prudent to yield to the popular wish. The King addressed letters to the clergy and nobles, who remained out, requesting them to join the Commons without delay; these were backed by others from the Count d'Artois, stating that the King's life was in danger; and

[4] The King's speech will be found in Toulongeon, *Hist. de France depuis la Révol.*, t. i.; *Pièces justif.*, p. 77; and in the *Hist. Parl.*, t. ii.

[5] Ferrières, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 65 sq. (Coll. Berville et Barrière).

under these representations the union of the whole Assembly was effected, June 27th, amid the enthusiastic cheers of the *tiers état*. Thus the nobles who, in the States-General of 1614, had exclaimed, "There is the same difference between us and the *tiers état* as between master and valet," were at length compelled to abandon their arrogant pretensions.[6]

One of the worst symptoms for the royal cause was the disaffection of the soldiery. There had been great abuses in the administration of the army. While forty-six million livres were allotted in the budget to the officers, only forty-four million were distributed among the men.[7] The Count de St. Germain, appointed Minister of War in 1775, had contributed to the disaffection of the troops by reforms and innovations in discipline, and especially by the introduction of corporal punishment. The army, corrupted by a long peace, had become almost a body of citizens, and had extensively imbibed the prevailing democratic opinions. This was more particularly the case with the *Gardes Françaises*, who, being quartered in Paris, mixed freely with the people, and were thus exposed to every kind of seduction. This regiment, when called out to defend the archbishop's palace, had refused to fire upon the mob. Their colonel, M. de Chatelêt, had imprisoned in the Abbaye eleven of his men, who had taken an oath not to obey any order at variance with the resolutions of the Assembly, but they were delivered and fêted by the people on June 13th; while the dragoons sent to disperse the mob had fraternised with them.[8]

The Court, however, had not yet abandoned the project of carrying matters with a high hand. Large bodies of troops, consisting chiefly of German and Swiss regiments, who could be best relied on, were assembled in the neighbourhood of Paris, and Marshal Broglie was summoned to Versailles to take the command of them. All this was done with too much display if the intention was to act, and with too little if the object was only to overawe and intimidate. The King was to appear in the Assembly, and compel it to accept the Declaration of June 23rd, of which 4000 copies had been printed for circulation in the provinces; and the Assembly was then to be dissolved.[9] The King suffered these preparations to be made, though it lay not in his character ever to employ them. When his advisers, comprising the more resolute or violent party of the Court, including the Queen, the Count d'Artois, the Polignacs, the Baron de Bretueil, and others, thought

[6] Florimond Rapine, ap. L. Blanc, t. i. p. 178.

[7] Necker, *Administration, &c.*, ap. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. i. p. 72.

[8] Michelet, *Ibid.*, t. i. p. 82.

[9] Ferrières, t. i. p. 70 sqq.

themselves sufficiently strong, they persuaded him to dismiss Necker and three other ministers, July 11th; another false step, which may be said to have put the seal to the Revolution.

At this time the aspect of Paris was alarming. Thousands of ragged and starving wretches had crowded thither from the provinces. The bakers' doors were besieged; bread was upwards of 4 sous a pound, then a famine price, and very bad; a sort of camp of 20,000 mendicants had been formed at Montmartre. Thus all the materials for sedition and violence were collected, and the Palais Royal, belonging to the Duke of Orléans, was a centre for setting them in motion. No police officer could enter its privileged precincts, and, by the connivance of the Duke, its garden and coffee-houses became the resort of all the agitators and demagogues of Paris. The Café Foy, especially, was converted into a sort of revolutionary club, whose leading members were Camille Desmoulins and Loustalot, two advocates who had abandoned the profession of the law for the more profitable one of journalists, and a democratic nobleman of Herculean proportions and Stentorian voice, the Marquis de St. Huruge. A secret conclave sat in an upper story, concocting inflammatory addresses and planning seditious riots; whilst on the floor of the *café*, where a bar had been erected resembling that in the National Assembly, the demagogues appeared and made their incendiary motions. At night the garden was filled with a promiscuous crowd; little groups were formed, in which calumnious denunciations were made, and the most violent resolutions adopted. It seems to have been by this conclave of sedition that the brigands called Marseillese were brought to Paris, who took the lead in every act of violence and blood, and inspired the Parisian populace with their own ferocity.[10]

The news of Necker's dismissal reached Paris the following evening (Sunday, July 12th) about four o'clock in the afternoon. The people immediately crowded to the Palais Royal. Camille Desmoulins appeared at a window of the Café Foy with a pistol in his hand, and exhorted the people to resistance. He then descended into the garden, plucked a leaf, and placed it in his hat by way of a green cockade, the colour of Necker's livery, an example that was immediately imitated by the mob. Busts of Necker and the Duke of Orléans were seized at a sculptor's on the Boulevard du Temple and paraded through the streets by the rabble, some thousands of whom were armed with pikes, sabres, and other

[10] See Camille Desmoulins, *Révol. de France*; *Actes des Apôtres*, No. xxvii. ap. Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. pp. 59, 119; Marmontel, *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 123.

weapons. The theatres were compelled to close their doors, and several houses and shops were plundered. The mob, on entering the Place Louis XV., now Place de la Concorde, were charged and dispersed by a cavalry regiment, the *Royal Allemand*, commanded by the Prince de Lambesc, and some blood was shed. The person who carried the bust of Necker, described as "an elegant young man," was shot, and a Savoyard, who bore that of the Duke of Orléans, was wounded. The *gardes Françaises* took part with the people.

The riots were continued on the following day. The populace crowded to the Hôtel de Ville to demand arms and ammunition, which were distributed to them by a member of the Electoral Committee. Parties, headed by some of the *gardes Françaises*, broke open the prisons, liberated the prisoners confined for debt, plundered the Convent St. Lazare of grain, and the *Garde Meuble* of arms. But the most important event of July 13th was the creation of a civic militia, or national guard, of 48,000 men, by the self-constituted Permanent Committee of the Electors of Paris. These Electors, for the most part wealthy burgesses, had resolved, in spite of the prohibition of the Government, to remain assembled, in order to complete their instructions to the Deputies. After the *coup d'état* of June 23rd, they met at a *traiteur's*, and resolved to support the Assembly. Thuriot, one of the most active of their number, advised them to go to the Hôtel de Ville and demand the Salle St. Jean for their permanent sittings, which was abandoned to them.[11] The institution of the National Guard proclaimed the assumption of the sovereignty by the people. The King's soldiers were now outnumbered and surrounded.

Next day, July 14th, the insurrection assumed a still more violent and decided character. A vast crowd repaired to the Hôtel des Invalides, which they entered without resistance, although six battalions of Swiss and 800 horse were encamped in the immediate neighbourhood. Here the people seized 28,000 muskets and several cannon. Arms and ammunition had also been procured at the Hôtel de Ville. Shouts of "*To the Bastille!*" were now raised, and the armed multitude directed themselves upon that fortress. Its garrison consisted of only eighty-two *Invalides* and thirty-two Swiss, and these were destitute of provisions for a siege; but the place was strongly fortified, and well supplied with cannon and ammunition. The Governor, M. de Launay, had made preparations for defence, and a determined commander might have held

[11] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. i. p. 70.

the place against an undisciplined mob till succour should arrive. But de Launay was not a regular soldier. He was weak enough to admit Thuriot, the Elector already mentioned, into the fortress, and to parley with him. Although Thuriot assured the people of the pacific intentions of the Governor, he could not persuade them to desist from the siege. Many of the assailants displayed remarkable instances of valour, especially Elie and Hullin, belonging to the *gardes Françaises*, who had joined the mob, and a man named Maillard, whom we shall meet again in other scenes of the Revolution. After a siege of a few hours, when the garrison had lost only three or four men, and the people nearly two hundred, De Launay, urged by his French troops, offered to capitulate, in spite of the remonstrances of the Swiss commander. The capitulation stipulated that the lives of the garrison should be spared; but when the populace burst into the fortress they slew many of the *Invalides* as well as the Swiss, their fury being especially directed against the officers. De Launay and his second in command, Major de Losme, were conducted towards the Hôtel de Ville, but were barbarously massacred in the Place de Grève, in spite of the efforts of Elie and Hullin to save them. These murders were immediately followed by that of M. de Flesselles, *Prevôt des Marchands*, or Provost of Paris, who was accused of having misled the people in their search for arms. The bleeding heads of De Launay and the Provost were hacked off, stuck upon pikes, and paraded through the streets in a sort of triumphal procession of the conquerors of the Bastille, and the bearers of them appear to have been paid by the civic authorities for their revolting services.[12] When the Bastille was invaded only seven prisoners were found, the greater part confined for forgery, and not a single one for a political offence. The fortress was soon after demolished to the foundations, by order of the National Assembly.

On the day after the capture of the Bastille, an Elector proposed Lafayette as commander of the National Guard, a nomination that was received with universal approbation. In like manner Bailly, the astronomer, now President of the National Assembly, was proposed as *Prevôt des Marchands*, in place of the murdered De Flesselles. "No," exclaimed Brissot, "not Provost of the Merchants, but Mayor of Paris;" and the new magistrate and his new title were adopted by acclamation.[13] It was now that the three-

[12] See the *Report* of the Abbé Lefèvre, one of the Committee of Electors, in Toulongeon, t. i.; *Pièces Justif.*, p. 94; and the Interrogatory of Desnot at the Châtelet, in Croker's *Essays on the French Revolution*, p. 67.

[13] Ferrières, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 145; Bailly, *Mém.*, t. ii. p. 25 (Coll. Berville et Barrière).

coloured cockade, borrowed probably from the livery of the Duke of Orléans, was first assumed; though some derive it from the city colours, with the addition of white, the Bourbon colour, added in consequence of the King's address to the Assembly, which we shall presently mention, and intended to symbolise the alliance of the monarchy with the Revolution.[14]

The monarchy was evidently in the throes of a crisis. Two courses only were open to the King: either to fly to some other part of the kingdom and place himself at the head of his troops in defence of his throne, or to accept the Revolution. The former of these steps was advocated by Marie Antoinette, and a considerable portion of the Court and Council. But its success would have been very doubtful. The greater part of the army, as well as of the nation, were favourable to the Revolution; above all, Louis XVI. possessed not energy enough to carry out successfully so bold a step. He decided for the other alternative. On July 15th, after learning from the Duke de Liancourt the capture of the Bastille, which it had been endeavoured to conceal from him, he proceeded without state and ceremony, and accompanied only by his two brothers, Monsieur and the Count d'Artois, to the Assembly; where, addressing the deputies as the representatives of the nation, and expressing his confidence in their fidelity and affection, he informed them that he had ordered the troops to quit Paris and Versailles, and authorised them to acquaint the authorities of the capital with what he had done.

Not content with this step, Louis declared his intention of visiting Paris, in order, as he said, to put the seal to the reconciliation between crown and people. The Queen was very much opposed to this proceeding, which certainly seems something worse than a mere work of supererogation; a voluntary and even pompous acknowledgment of the degradation of the throne, which afforded a triumph to the populace, and was calculated to increase its audacity. But the King, having first taken the sacrament, and having given his elder brother, the Count of Provence, a paper appointing him Lieutenant-General of the kingdom, in case anything should happen to himself, set off for Paris, July 17th, accompanied by 100 members of the National Assembly. He was received at the gates of Paris by Bailly, the new mayor, and by the national guard under arms. In an address more remarkable for its truth than for its politeness and good taste, Bailly observed, in presenting the keys of the city: "These, Sire, are the same keys that were offered to Henry IV.,

[14] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 94.

the conqueror of his people; to-day it is the people who have reconquered their King." Louis then passed on to the Hôtel de Ville escorted by those armed bands which had recently given such terrible proofs of their ferocity; yet he betrayed not the least sign of trepidation. He appeared at a window of the Hôtel de Ville with the national colours on his breast; he confirmed Bailly and Lafayette in their respective offices; announced his consent to the recall of Necker; and after listening to a few speeches, and expressing his satisfaction at finding himself in the midst of his people, he took his departure amid cries of *Vive le Roi*!

These scenes of violence, the inability of the Government to repress them, the manifest ascendancy of the Revolution, induced many of the princes and nobles to emigrate. The King's brother, the Count d'Artois, the Prince of Condé, the Prince of Conti, the Duke d'Enghien, the Duke of Bourbon, the Duke of Polignac and his family, and numerous other persons of distinction, left Paris for Turin a few days after the capture of the Bastille. This conduct of the nobles is inexcusable. It was they who had contributed to the Revolution by bringing into vogue the new philosophy, and now they deserted the throne, as well as their own cause which they had endangered; made by their flight a sort of declaration of war against the nation, and, at the same time, a confession of the hopelessness of resistance. It can hardly be said, however, with Madame de Staël,[15] that they were in no danger. A list of proscriptions had been formed at the Palais Royal, in which the Queen, the Count d'Artois, the Duchess of Polignac and others, were marked for death.[16] Such was the surveillance already exercised over the royal family that the Queen dared not to be present at the departure of her friend, the Duchess of Polignac.[17]

The King's visit to Paris had no effect in taming the ferocity of the people, which had been whetted by the taste of blood. A few days after, July 22nd, Foulon, an old man of seventy-five, one of the new ministers appointed after Necker's dismissal, and his son-in-law, Berthier de Sauvigny, were massacred by the populace in the Place de Grève, in spite of all the attempts of Bailly and Lafayette to save them. Foulon had made himself unpopular by his harshness, and by some contemptuous remarks which he was reported to have made about the people, but which were most probably calumnies of the journals. Berthier had been an honest and intelligent administrator, but disliked for his haughtiness. A

[15] *Œuvres*, t. xiii. p. 262.
[16] Ferrières, *Mémoires*, t. i. p. 136; cf. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. i. p. 107.
[17] Madame Campan, *Memoirs*, vol. ii. ch. iii. (Engl. Transl.)

dragoon ripped out his heart; his head, as well as that of his father-in-law, was cut off and paraded through Paris. Lafayette, disgusted at brutalities which he could not control, tendered his resignation; but the Sections refused to accept it. These atrocities were approved even by men of position and education. Barnave, a member of the Assembly, who, however, afterwards displayed a better spirit, remarked in reference to the murder of Foulon and his son-in-law: "Was then the blood that has been shed so pure?" And Camille Desmoulins, who possessed considerable talent, and was far from being the most depraved of the revolutionary leaders, assumed, with a repulsive levity, the title of *procureur-général de la lanterne*, or solicitor-general for the lamp.[18]

The example of the metropolis was speedily imitated in the provinces. Municipal guards were everywhere instituted under the ostensible pretence of averting plunder and violence; but the men composing them were all adverse to the ancient institutions. Tolls and custom-houses were destroyed, and many unpopular officials and suspected engrossers of corn were hanged. The movement spread to the rural districts of central and southern France, and especially of Brittany; châteaux and convents were destroyed, and in Alsace and Franche Comté several of the nobles were put to death, in some cases with horrible tortures. It was about this time that the term *aristocrat* began to be used as synonymous with an enemy of the people. At Caen, M. de Belzunce, a major in the army, denounced in the infamous Journal of Marat, was slain by the people for endeavouring to maintain discipline in his regiment; a woman tore out his heart, and is said to have devoured it![19] In the northern parts of France the peasants were less violent, and contented themselves with refusing to pay tithes or to perform any feudal services. Throughout great part of France a vague terror prevailed of an army of brigands said to be paid by the aristocrats to destroy the crops by mowing them in the blade, in order to produce a famine.

The order for Necker's recall overtook him at Basle. He returned to Versailles towards the end of July, presented himself to the National Assembly, then hastened to Paris, where, by dint of intreaty, he procured from the Committee of Electors a general amnesty for the enemies of the Revolution; a decree, however,

[18] Toulongeon observes, t. i. p. 115, that the burlesque pleasantry of the term tended to render murder "une gaité à la mode." The *lanterne* of the Place de Grève was made to play the part of Pasquin's statue at Rome, and facetious addresses to the people were issued in its name. It became one of the curiosities of Paris, and was visited by every traveller. *Ibid.*, *Pièces Justif.*; p. 114.

[19] Prudhomme, *Hist. Générale*, p. 146; Dumouriez, *Mémoires*.

which the Sections immediately compelled the Electors to reverse, and which had only the effect of rendering Necker himself suspected. He had not yet discovered the true character of the Revolution. He was still infatuated enough to think that he could direct a movement, to which his own acts had so essentially contributed; and in his overweening confidence, he neglected to form a party in the Assembly, and to conciliate its more dangerous leaders.

The National Assembly, or, as it was called from its labours in drawing up a constitution, the Constituent Assembly, contained some of the ablest men in France, and many of its members were undoubtedly animated with a sincere desire to establish, on a lasting basis, the liberty and welfare of the French people. It was divided into three principal parties. On the right of the president sat the conservatives, or supporters of the ancient *régime*, composed mostly of the prelates and higher nobles. The chief speaker, and it may be said the only orator, on this side was the Abbé Maury, though Cazalès defended with considerable ability the cause of the nobles. The centre was occupied by the constitutionalists, who were desirous of establishing a limited monarchy, somewhat after the English model. The most distinguished members of this party were the Count of Clermont Tonnerre, Count Lally Tollendal, Mounier, Malouet, the Duke de la Rochefoucault, the Duke de Liancourt, the Viscount Montmorenci, the Marquis de Montesquiou, and others. From the supposed stagnation of its principles, this section was called the *Marais*. The popular, or ultra-democratic party, occupied the benches on the left. The principles of this party were neither very defined nor very consistent. They, of course, carried their views further than the constitutionalists; but none of them were yet republicans, though some may have desired a change of dynasty. The chief political principle which they held in common was the union of the monarchy with a single chamber, or what has been called a royal democracy. Among them might be seen the Duke of Orléans, the Marquis Lafayette, Bailly, Mirabeau, Duport, Barnave, the two Lameths, the Abbé Sieyès, Talleyrand, Robespierre, and others. As the Revolution proceeded, many of these men became republicans, whilst others, on the contrary, joined the constitutional party.

Louis Philippe Joseph, Duke of Orléans, great-grandson of the Regent, possessed all his ancestor's profligacy and want of principle, without his ability. The chief motives of his political conduct were hatred of the reigning family, and especially of the Queen, and some vague hopes that their overthrow might enable him to

usurp the crown. But nature had not qualified him for such a part. He was destitute of the qualities which inspire confidence and devotion, and at no time does he appear to have had adherents enough to constitute a party.[20] Exhausted by a dissolute life, the tool of designing men, who employed his enormous wealth to forward their own purposes, he was but the dupe, and at last the victim, of the Revolution.

Robespierre, an advocate of Arras, whose name became at last the epitome of the Revolution, played but a subordinate part in the Constituent Assembly. He was considered a dull man, and his appearance in the tribune was the signal for merriment. When with pain and difficulty he expressed his opinions in dry, inflexible formulas, transports of insulting mirth broke out on all sides.[21] Such was then the man who was afterwards to inspire his audience with very different emotions. But Robespierre was not to be so put down. He continued his efforts with the perseverance which forms so marked a trait in his character; and after the death of Mirabeau, he began to be heard with more attention, and even acquired a considerable influence in the Assembly.

Of all the early leaders of the Revolution, Mirabeau was by far the most remarkable. Honoré Gabriel Riquetti, Count de Mirabeau, was the son of the Marquis Mirabeau, to whom we have already alluded as the author of *L'Ami du Peuple*, and was born at Bignon in March 1749. The family was originally of Neapolitan extraction, but had been long settled in Provence. The early youth of Count Mirabeau was marked by profligacy, united, however, with brilliant talents, and considerable literary acquirements. After being imprisoned more than once at the instance of his father, after marrying a rich heiress, squandering her fortune, and then deserting her for the wife of the Marquis de Mounier, whom he had seduced, he was compelled to fly to Holland with his new mistress, where their sole support was derived from his pen. Many of his early productions are licentious in the extreme, but were mingled with works on political subjects. Sometimes he was base enough to receive the wages of a hired libellist; sometimes he sold to a new purchaser manuscripts that had been already paid for. His father called him, "My son, the word-merchant."[22] From Holland he was transferred by a *lettre de cachet* to the dungeons of Vincennes; and after his liberation from that prison, he passed

[20] Both Madame de Staël, *Considérations, &c.*, Partie ii. ch. vi., and her critic, Bailleul, *Examen, &c.*, t. i. p. 336, are at one upon this point.

[21] Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. iii. p. 36.

[22] *Ibid.*, t. ii. p. 241.

some time in England and in Prussia. By temper and inclination an aristocrat, the French Revolution found Mirabeau ready to plunge into all the excesses of democracy in order to retrieve his ruined fortunes. His personal qualities fitted him for the part of a tribune of the people. In person stout and muscular, though somewhat undersized; having a countenance seamed with the small-pox and of almost repulsive ugliness, but animated with the fire of genius, and capable of striking an adversary with awe, he possessed an eloquence of that fiery and impetuous kind which is irresistible in popular assemblies. His disorderly and adventurous life had made him reckless and abandoned to a degree that he seemed almost to glory in his infamy; while the debts with which he was overwhelmed rendered him willing to sell, or rather as he himself expressed it, to hire himself, to the Government, or to any one who would pay an adequate price for his talents and services.[23]

The debates of the Assembly were conducted with that mixture of formality and vivaciousness which is peculiar to the French character. They consisted for the most part of long and laboured harangues, or rather regular treatises, beginning from first principles, prepared and generally written beforehand. Even the impetuous Mirabeau adopted this method, and his orations are said not to have been always composed by himself. Hence it followed that the different speeches had little connection with one another; the arguments of preceding speakers were left unanswered, and the debates resembled a series of essays delivered in an academy, rather than the intellectual gladiatorship of a popular assembly.[24] Not unfrequently, however, the Chamber became the scene of indescribable disorder and tumult. All the members spoke at once with violent gesticulations and confused and unintelligible apostrophes, which were echoed back by the spectators in the tribunes. In vain the president endeavoured to restore order by ringing his bell with all his might; while the orators, with animated looks, their lips in motion, but quite inaudible, beat the air with their arms, and resembled wrestlers preparing for a contest. A German who was present at some of these debates, compares them to the hubbub and confusion of a Jews' school.[25]

But the Assembly were no more their own masters than were the King and Government. The persons styling themselves "the patriotic assembly of the Palais Royal" overawed the deputies

[23] For Mirabeau's private character see Dumont, *Souvenirs de Mirabeau*.

[24] See Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Revol.*, t. iii. p. 76.

[25] See Campe, *Briefe, aus Paris*, S. 175.

with open threats. Thus, for instance, they compelled Thouret, who passed for an aristocrat, to resign the presidency of the Assembly, to which he had been nominated.[26] Another means of intimidation was through the admission of the public into the tribunes of the Assembly, or spectators' galleries. This custom had been established by Duport, Lameth, and Barnave, a triumvirate which at this time formed the nucleus of the democratic party, and became subsequently the principal leaders in the Jacobin Club. The tribunes, when occasion required, were filled with the most ferocious of the populace, who are supposed to have been paid.

While such was the character of the Assembly and such the state of France, the châteaux and convents blazing in the provinces, the capital in a state of open revolt, and while no authority appeared either able or willing to put a stop to these excesses, the famous sacrifice of their privileges by the nobles and clergy on the night of August 4th has at least as much the appearance of a concession extorted from fear as of that generous and patriotic devotion to which some writers have ascribed it. The privileged orders were in fact giving up only what they had no longer any hope of retaining. The self-sacrifice was initiated by the Viscount de Noailles, who proposed the abolition of all feudal rights and of the remains of personal servitude. Moved by a sort of contagious enthusiasm, the nobles and landed proprietors now vied with one another in offering up their privileges. In this memorable night were decreed the abolition of serfdom, the power of redeeming seignorial rights, the suppression of seignorial jurisdiction, the abolition of exclusive rights of chase and warren, the abolition of tithe, the equalisation of imposts, the admission of all ranks to civil and military offices, the abolition of the sale of charges, the reformation of *jurandes* and *maîtrises*, and the suppression of sinecure pensions. The Assembly, as if overcome with a sense of its own liberality, and desirous of connecting the King with such important reforms, decreed that a medal should be struck in commemoration of them, on which Louis should be designated as the restorer of French liberty. These renunciations were followed on the part of many of the bishops and higher clergy by the resignation of their richest benefices and preferments. Hereditary nobility had already been abolished by a Decree of June 19th. Thus the abuses of centuries fell at a single blow. And though, when the enthusiasm of the moment had cooled, and these general resolutions came to be discussed in detail

[26] Mounier, *Exposé de ma Conduite*, p. 31, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 103.

in order to be embodied in decrees, an opposition destructive of all gratitude was manifested by those whose interests they touched, yet they were substantially carried out and presented, August 13th, to the King, who presided at a *Te Deum* performed in honour of the occasion. It was, however, observed with dismay that concessions so ample had failed to tranquillise the public mind. Acts of atrocious violence were still committed in the provinces; châteaux continued to be burnt; and the people, not content with the enjoyment of their newly-acquired rights, perpetrated frightful devastations on the estates of their former oppressors.

The Assembly having thus cleared the ground, entered on their task of building up a new Constitution. By way of preamble they drew up a Declaration of the Rights of Man, at the end of which they recapitulated all the privileges, distinctions, and monopolies which they had abolished.[27] On the motion of Lafayette, the right of resistance to oppression was included in the Declaration. The constitutional labours of the Assembly will claim our attention at its dissolution, and it will here suffice to state that the three principal questions first discussed were those of the King's *veto*, of the permanence or periodicity of the Assembly, and whether it should consist of one or more Chambers. The *veto* gave rise to much angry discussion both within and without the Assembly. It was warmly debated whether there should be any at all, and, if any, whether it should be absolute or merely suspensive. The patriots of the Palais Royal addressed a letter to the president, in which they said, "they had the honour to inform him that, if the aristocratic part of the Assembly continued to disturb the public harmony, 15,000 men were ready to 'light-up' (*éclairer*) their châteaux and houses, and particularly that of the president himself."[28] At this time, however, there was a sort of reaction at the Hôtel de Ville, and the Palais Royal was kept in order. Mirabeau, to the surprise of many, was a warm partisan of the *veto*. He had declared that, without it, he would rather live at Constantinople than in France; that he knew nothing more terrible than the aristocratic sovereignty of 600 persons.[29] Louis himself is said to have preferred a suspensory to an absolute *veto*; and it was at last decreed that the King should have the power of suspending a

[27] It will be found in Lacretelle, *Hist. de France*, t. vii., and in the *Hist. Parlem.*, t. ii.

[28] *Moniteur*, t. i. p. 399, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 104.

[29] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. i. p. 42. The nature of the *veto* was a great puzzle to the common people. Many took it to be some dangerous person, and one man voted him *à la lanterne*! Toulongeon, t. i. p. 114.

measure during two legislatures, or, as we should say, two parliaments, each lasting two years. Montesquieu's school, or that which proposed the English Constitution as a model, and consequently advocated two Chambers, mustered very strong in the Committee of Constitution. But the idea of an upper House was contrary to the current of popular feeling; the people regarded it as a counter-revolution, while the ancient *noblesse* contemned it as a new-fangled dignity. The establishment of a single Chamber was also aided by the counter-revolutionary party, who not unreasonably imagined that such a constitution could not be durable, though they did not anticipate the manner of its fall. It was decided that the legislature should be permanent. It was also decreed by acclamation, September 15th, that the King's person was inviolable, the throne indivisible, the crown hereditary in the reigning family from male to male in the order of primogeniture.[30]

While the Assembly were still engaged on this subject, an event occurred which gave a new turn to the Revolution, and which may be accounted the chief cause that ultimately rendered all their labours nugatory. A plot had been formed to bring the King to Paris, and rumours of it had reached the Court. Mirabeau appears to have been in the secret, and had obscurely intimated it to Blaizot, the King's librarian. He had also been heard to say that an insurrection would be possible only if the women should take part in it and place themselves at its head. It can hardly be doubted that the Duke of Orléans was at the bottom of the plot, whose creature Mirabeau at that time was; though the *Châtelet* declined to name him in the investigation which took place before that tribunal in the following August. The Duke and his partisans hoped at least to alarm the King into flight; perhaps even to effect his deposition or even his murder. Several Royalist deputies had received confidential letters that October 5th had been fixed upon for striking a decisive blow, and had attempted, but without effect, to persuade Louis XVI. to transfer the Assembly to Tours. Lafayette himself, in a letter of September 18th, had advised M. de St. Priest, one of the ministers, of the intention of the grenadiers of the national guard, consisting of three companies of the *gardes Françaises* enrolled in that force, and receiving pay, to march to Versailles. At this time the military service of the palace was performed by the national guards of Versailles, and the only regular force there was a small body of *gardes du corps*. Under

[30] *Moniteur*, Séance du September 15th, ap. L. Blanc, t. iii. p. 82.

these circumstances, it became necessary to provide for the security of the King and royal family. The commanders of the national guard of Versailles, declining to undertake that they would be capable of resisting some 2000 well-armed and disciplined men, the municipality of the town were persuaded to demand the aid of a regiment; the King's orders were issued to that effect, and on September 23rd the regiment of Flanders arrived.[31]

Efforts were soon made to seduce this regiment from its allegiance; while the Court, by marks of favour, sought to retain its affections. The officers of the *gardes du corps* and those of the national guard of Versailles, invited the newly-arrived officers to a dinner on October 2nd. There was nothing unusual in this; but the Court, by lending the Palace theatre for the banquet, seemed to make it a kind of political demonstration. The boxes were filled with the ladies and retainers of the Court; the healths of the different members of the royal family were drunk with enthusiasm, and, it is said, with drawn swords; the toast of "the nation" was either refused, or, at all events, omitted. As the bottle circulated, the enthusiasm naturally increased, and was wound up to the highest pitch of excitement when the Queen appeared, leading the Dauphin in her hand. The loyal song, *O Richard, ô mon Roi! l'univers t'abandonne,* was sung; the boxes were escaladed, and white cockades and black, the latter the Austrian colour, were distributed by the fair hands of the ladies.

The news of these proceedings, accompanied, of course, with the usual exaggerations, as that the national cockade had been trampled under foot, &c., caused a great sensation at Paris. Little groups assembled in the squares and public gardens, and alarming reports were circulated that a counter-revolution was preparing. The excitement was purposely increased by agitators, whose designs were promoted by the scarcity of bread which prevailed at that time. The supply of flour to the metropolis was always ill-regulated. There was never any considerable stock on hand; and Bailly, as appears from his *Memoirs,* was in a constant state of anxiety as to how the Parisians were to be fed. The cry against forestallers frightened the merchants from keeping any large stocks; the farmers being molested in their trade would not thrash; the millers would not grind. The municipality advanced large sums to keep down the price; but the consequence of this

[31] See the *Annals* of Bertrand de Moleville, translated by Dallas, vol. ii. ch. xv.; Prudhomme, *Hist. des erreurs, des fautes et des crimes commis pendant la Révol.*, t. iii. p. 164 sq.; *Evidence of Blaizot before the Châtelet, Procédure, &c.*, p. 51, ap. L. Blanc, t. iii. ch. viii.; Croker, *Essays on the Fr. Revol.*, p. 45; Toulongeon, t. i. p. 234 sq.

was that the *banlieue* for ten leagues round came to Paris to supply themselves with bread.[32] The emigration of the rich added to the distress. The scarcity seems also to have been aggravated by the artifices of designing persons, by buying up the bakers' stocks, or by bribing them not to light their ovens. At daybreak, on October 5th, the Place de Grève was suddenly filled with troops of women; one of them, seizing a drum at a neighbouring guard-house, and beating it violently, went through the streets, followed by her companions shouting *bread! bread!* They were gradually joined by bands of men, some of them in female attire, armed with pikes and clubs. A cry was raised, *To Versailles!* and the grotesque but ferocious army, led by Maillard, one of the heroes of the Bastille, took the road to that place.

Lafayette had hastened to the Hôtel de Ville on the first alarm; but many hours were lost in debating whether the national guard should be despatched after the insurgents, and it was not till late in the day that he began his march with a considerable body of that force. He was accompanied by two representatives of the Section of the Carmes, who were to present to the King, on the part of the *Commune* or municipality, the four following demands: that he should intrust the safety of his person to the national guards of Paris and Versailles; that he should inform the *Commune* respecting the supply of corn; that he should grant a constitution; and that he should give a proof of his love for the people by taking up his residence at Paris. Lafayette halted his troops on the road, and caused them to take an oath to respect the royal residence.

While the insurgents were approaching, St. Priest had in vain advised that their march should be arrested at the bridges over the Seine. When they arrived, he urged the King to fly, telling him, what the event proved to be true, that if he was conducted to Paris his crown was lost. Necker opposed both these counsels. The King's best safeguard, he said, was the affections of the people; and as the other ministers were equally divided in opinion, nothing was done.[33] Meanwhile the women arrived; and a large body of them, headed by Maillard, penetrated into the Assembly. Maillard addressed the members with insulting words and gestures; asserted that there was a counter-revolutionary party among them; denounced the aristocrats as conspiring to starve the people, the *gardes du corps* as having insulted the national cockade. Outside a disturbance arose between the crowd and the King's guards,

[32] See Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. i. p. 233 sqq.

[33] Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. iii. p. 207 sqq.

which, however, was appeased by the opportune arrival of Lafayette and his troops. Tranquillity seemed at last to be restored; five of the women had been admitted to an audience of the King, and had retired overwhelmed with a sense of his kindness; the night, or rather the morning of the following day, was far advanced, and Lafayette, overcome with fatigue, retired to rest. But about five o'clock he was aroused by the report of fresh tumults. Some fighting had taken place between the mob and the troops, and several of the *gardes du corps* had been either killed or wounded. The people had penetrated into the palace through a gate that had been negligently left open; the Queen was barely able to escape, half dressed, from her chamber to the King's apartments; the guards at her door had been cut down, but the mob did not succeed in forcing an entrance. The lives of the royal family were, in all probability, only saved by the appearance of Lafayette. He persuaded the King to show himself on the balcony of the palace; he himself led forward the Queen, accompanied by her children, knelt down and kissed her hand amid the applauses of the people. Tumultuous cries now arose of "The King to Paris!" Louis had expressed some hesitation on this point to the deputies of the *Commune*, though he had acceded to their other demands; but after a short interval he reappeared on the balcony and announced his intention of proceeding to the capital.

On this eventful morning the Duke of Orléans, dressed in a grey surtout and a little switch in his hand, was seen mixing with the mob of rioters. He was saluted with cries of "Long live father Orléans! Long live *King* Orléans!" at which he was observed to smile. It was he who pointed out to the mob the staircase leading to the Queen's apartments. The man who kept the *buvette* of the Assembly distributed to all comers *pâtés*, ham, fruits, and wine at the Duke's expense. Mirabeau had been seen, on the previous day, going from group to group with a sabre under his arm, and was heard to say: "My friends, we are with you." And it is certain, says M. Louis Blanc, that he had long been intriguing *for somebody*.[34]

[34] *Hist. de la Revol.*, t. iii. p. 251. For the facts adduced above, see the *Procédure* before the Châtelet. The most striking proof that the Duke of Orléans was plotting against the King's life, is a paper found several years after the duke's execution, and dated Oct. 6th 1789, in which he orders his bankers not to pay the sums agreed upon, as Louis was still alive. "Courez vite, mon cher, chez le banquier, qu'il ne délivre pas la somme; l'argent n'est point gagné, le marmot vit encore." Ducoin, *Ph. d'Orléans*, ap. Von Sybel. *Gesch. der Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 110. M. Blanc starts a novel hypothesis, which he supports with some plausible arguments, that *Monsieur* the King's brother, and not the Duke of Orléans, was the

The march of the crowd and captive King to Paris was at once horrible and grotesque. The royal carriage was preceded by a disorderly cavalcade, composed of *gardes du corps* and *gardes Françaises*, who had exchanged parts of their uniform in token of peace and fraternity. Then followed several pieces of cannon, on which rode some of the women, bearing loaves and pieces of meat stuck on pikes and bayonets. Maillard and some of the women had been sent back to Paris in the royal carriages. The heads of two of the faithful *gardes du corps*, which had been hacked off by the wretch known as Jourdan *Coupe-tête*, had been despatched to Paris early in the morning. The way was lined by the inhabitants of the surrounding villages, who came out to gaze upon the strange and melancholy spectacle. From the encumbered state of the roads the procession moved only at a foot-pace, and was often compelled to stop; when those furies in the shape of women would dance round the royal carriage like cannibals before a feast of human flesh. "We shall not die of hunger," they exclaimed, "for here is the baker, his wife, and the little apprentice!" The King was accompanied by two bishops of his council, who, as the carriage entered the capital, were saluted with cries of "All the bishops to the lamp!" Thus were the royal family conducted to the Tuileries, which had not been inhabited for a century and contained no proper accommodation for its new inmates.

The events of October 6th may be said to have decided the fate of the French monarchy. The King was now virtually a prisoner and a hostage in the hands of the Parisian rabble and its leaders. The Assembly, which soon followed the King to Paris, lost its independence at the same time. It met at first in the apartments of the *archevêché*, on an island of the Seine, between the faux-bourgs St. Antoine and St. Marceau, the most disturbed districts of Paris; but early in November it was transferred to the *manège* of the Tuileries, a large building running parallel with the terrace of the Feuillants, the site of which now forms part of the Rue de Rivoli. No distinction of seats was now observed; nobles, priests, and commons all sat *pêle-mêle* together. It was plain that there could be no longer any hope of a stable constitutional monarchy; and several moderate men withdrew from the Assembly, as Mounier, then its president, Lally Tollendal, and others. The Duke of Orléans, suspected of being the author of the insurrection, was dismissed to London on pretençe of a political mission. He

usurper in *prospectu* for whom Mirabeau was intriguing. The question is too long to be discussed here; but we must confess that we have not been convinced by M. Blanc's reasoning.

arrived in that capital towards the end of October, and was received, both by court and people, with marked contempt. He was frightened into accepting this mission by the threats of Lafayette.[35] Mirabeau was furious at his departure, and exclaimed, with a vulgar epithet, that he was a poor wretch, and deserved not the trouble that had been taken for him. The Duke returned to France in the summer of 1790; but from this time forward he had lost his popularity.[36]

At this period the reign of the Palais Royal was supplanted by that of the Jacobins. The Jacobin Club was one of the most portentous features of the Revolution; or rather it may be said to have ultimately become the Revolution itself. It originated at Versailles soon after the meeting of the States-General, and was at first called the *Club des Bretons*, from its having been founded by the forty deputies of Bretagne, who met together to concert their attacks upon the ministry. It was soon joined by the deputies of Dauphiné and Franche Comté, and gradually by others; as the Abbé Sieyès, the two Lameths, Adrien Duport, the Duke D'Aiguillon, M. de Noailles, and others. When the Assembly was transferred to Paris, the Breton Club hired a large apartment in the Rue St. Honoré, belonging to the preaching Dominican Friars, who were commonly called *Jacobins* because their principal house was in the Rue St. Jacques; and hence the same name was vulgarly given to the club, though they now called themselves "the Friends of the Constitution." After a little time, persons who were not deputies were admitted; the debates were thrown open to the public; and as no other qualifications were required for membership than a blind submission to the leaders, and a subscription of twenty-four livres a year, it soon numbered 1200 members, including several foreigners. There was a *bureau* for the president, a tribune, and stalls round the sides of the chamber. The club held its sittings thrice a week at seven o'clock in the evening; the order of the day in the Assembly was often debated overnight by the Jacobins, and opinions in a certain measure dictated to the deputies. The club disseminated and enforced its principles by means of its *Journal* and *Almanacks*, its hired mob, orators, singers, applauders, and hissers in the tribunes of the Assembly. For this last purpose, soldiers who had been drummed out of their regiments were principally selected; and in 1790, they consisted of between 700 and 800 men, under the command

[35] See *Mém. de Lafayette*, ap. Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Rév.*, t. iii.

[36] Ferrières, *Mém.*, t. i. liv. iv. p. 336 sqq.; *Tableau hist. de la Révol.*, par le Comte d'Escherny, t. i. p. 237.

of a certain Chevalier de St. Louis, to whom they swore implicit obedience. The Jacobins planted affiliated societies in the provinces, which gradually increased to the enormous quantity of 2400. At first the club consisted of well-educated and distinguished persons; 400 of them belonged to the Assembly, and may be said to have been the masters of it. The young Duke de Chartres, son of the Duke of Orléans, and afterwards King Louis Philippe, was an active member of the club. By degrees it grew more and more democratic, and became at last a sort of revolutionary Inquisition, and a legion of public accusers. It was known abroad by the name of the *Propaganda*, and was a terror to all Europe.[37] In the spring of 1790, several members of the club who did not approve its growing violence, as Sieyès, Talleyrand, Lafayette, Rœderer, Bailly, Dupont de Nemours, and others, established what they called the *Club of* 1789, with the view of upholding the original principles of the Revolution. They hired for 24,000 livres a splendid apartment in the Palais Royal, in the house now known as the *Trois Frères Provençaux*, where they dined at a louis d'or a head, after groaning in the Assembly over the miseries of the people. Mirabeau and a few other members continued also to belong to the Jacobins. A certain number of literary men were admitted, among whom may be mentioned Condorcet, Chamfort, and Marmontel. This club also had its journal, of which Condorcet was the editor.[38]

Journalism was also one of the most potent engines of the Revolution. A flood of journals began to be published contemporaneously with, or soon after, the opening of the States-General, as Mirabeau's *Courrier de Provence*, Gorsas' *Courrier de Versailles*, Brissot's *Patriote Français*, Barère's *Point du jour*, &c. The *Révolutions de Paris*, published in the name of the printer, Prudhomme, but edited by Loustalot, the most popular of all the journals, circulated sometimes 200,000 copies. At a rather later period appeared Marat's atrocious and blood-thirsty *Ami du peuple*, Camille Desmoulin's *Courrier de Brabant*, the wittiest, and Fréron's *Orateur du peuple*, the most violent, of all the journals, and ultimately Hébert's *Père Duchesne*, perhaps the most infamous of all.[39] For the most part, the whole stock of knowledge of these journalists had been picked up from Voltaire, Rousseau, and the authors of the *Encyclopédie*; but their ignorance

[37] Ferrières, *Mém.*, t. ii. p. 117 sqq.; Bertrand de Moleville, *Mém.*, t. ii. ch. xxxii.; Toulongeon, t. i. p. 278; Michelet, t. ii. p. 298 sqq.

[38] Barère, *Mém.*, t. i. p. 293; Ferrières, *Mém.*, t. ii.

[39] Michelet, t. i. p. 252 sq.

was combined with the most ridiculous vanity. Camille Desmoulins openly proclaimed that he had struck out a new branch of commerce —a manufacture of revolutions.[40] Marat seems to have derived his influence chiefly from his atrocious cynicism and blood-thirstiness; for his ability was small, though he had the most unbounded conceit of his own powers.[41] He was born at Boudri, near Neufchâtel, in Switzerland, in 1743. As a child he displayed a sort of precocious talent combined with a morose perversity; and in manhood the same disposition was shown by his attacks upon everybody who had gained a reputation. Thus he attempted to upset the philosophy of Newton and disputed his theory of optics, which he appears not to have comprehended, as well as Franklin's theory of electricity; and in a book which he published in reply to Helvetius, he spoke with the greatest contempt of Locke, Condillac, Malebranche, and Voltaire. His own writings abound with commonplace, which he abandons only to become absurd. He spent some time in England, during part of which he seems to have been employed as an usher at Warrington. In 1775 he published, at Edinburgh, a work in English, entitled the *Chains of Slavery*, which indicated his future course. On his return from England, he obtained the place of veterinary surgeon in the stables of the Count d'Artois, which he abandoned on the breaking out of the Revolution to become an editor. The bitterness of his literary failures seems to have worked up the natural spleen, envy, and malignity of his temper to an excess bordering upon madness. Cowardly as well as cruel, while he hid himself in garrets and cellars, he filled his journal with personal attacks and denunciations, and recommended not only murder but torture, as the cutting off of thumbs, burying alive, &c.[42]

After the removal of the King to Paris, the political atmosphere became somewhat calmer, though disturbances sometimes broke out on the old subject of the supply of bread. The populace seemed astonished that the presence of the King had not rendered that article more abundant; and about a fortnight after his arrival, they put to death a baker named François, on the charge of being a forestaller, and paraded his head through the city. But justice, this time, did not altogether sleep. Martial law was proclaimed; and a market-porter, who had taken part in

[40] See his *Révol. de France*, ap. Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 403.

[41] Thus in one of the numbers of his *Ami du peuple*, he says, "Je crois avoir épuisé toutes les combinaisons de l'esprit humain, sur la morale, la philosophie et la politique." Ap. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. ii. p. 386.

[42] Michelet, *Hist. de la Revol.*, t. iii. p. 119.

the outrage, was executed, to the great disgust of the populace, who exclaimed: "What liberty have we? Shall we not then be permitted to hang anybody?"[43]

The Assembly was divided into various committees of war, marine, jurisprudence, &c., of which the committee charged with drawing up the constitution was alone permanent. Its members were Mirabeau, Target, Duport, Chapelier, Desmeuniers, Talleyrand, Barnave, Lameth, and Sieyès. The Abbé Sieyès, whose studious and taciturn habits and abrupt sententious way of speaking had procured for him a reputation which he scarcely deserved, was one of the most active members of the Committee. It was he who presented the project for dividing France into eighty-three departments (December 22nd 1789). The question of the revenue, the real cause for summoning the States-General, seemed almost neglected. Necker had attempted to negociate two loans, but they failed; partly because the Assembly reduced the proposed interest too low, and partly from a want of confidence on the part of capitalists. Necker now proposed an extraordinary contribution of a fourth of all incomes, or an income-tax of twenty-five per cent., for one year. He accompanied the project with an earnest appeal to all good citizens to contribute to the necessities of the State. This appeal was cheerfully responded to by people of all ranks. The members of the Assembly deposited at the door their silver shoe-buckles; the King and Queen sent their plate to the mint; Necker himself placed bank-notes for 100,000 francs on the President's bureau; labouring men offered half their earnings, the women their rings and trinkets; even the very children parted with their playthings. Such expedients, however, could afford only a temporary and precarious relief. In this extremity the property of the Church offered a vast and tempting resource. Such property, it was argued, could be seized, or rather resumed, without injustice; it had been established only for a national purpose, and the State might appropriate it if that purpose could be fulfilled in another way.

The decree for the abolition of tithe had already passed among the offerings made on August 4th, in spite of the arguments of the Abbé Sieyès, who pointed out that tithes, as a charge upon land, had been allowed for in its purchase, and that to abolish them unconditionally was to make a present to the landed proprietors of an annual rent of 120,000,000 francs, or near 5,000,000*l.* sterling. Yet Mirabeau, and the greater part of the Assembly, either could not, or would not, understand this simple question of arithmetic; while

[43] Toulongeon, *Hist. de France*, t. i. p. 168.

Sieyès, who was the real democrat, by preventing the rich from being favoured at the expense of the poor, who would have to contribute to the new tax proposed for the maintenance of the clergy, lost much of his popularity by reminding the Assembly of common sense and common justice.[44] Well might he exclaim: "They want to be free and know not how to be just!" At the same time, Buzot, afterwards a member of the Gironde, had proposed to seize the Church lands and other property.[45] This proposition was not then attended to, but was renewed a few months later by the Bishop of Autun; and, after violent debates, was finally decreed by a large majority, November 2nd 1789.[46]

By this confiscation, to which were added the domains of the Crown, except those reserved for the recreation of the King, a large national fund was created. But there was a difficulty in realising it. A sum of 400,000,000 francs was required for 1790 and the following year; yet it was almost impossible to effect sales to so large an amount even at great sacrifices. The clergy made a last attempt to save their property by offering a loan of the sum required; but it was refused on the ground that it implied their recognition as proprietors. To meet this difficulty, the Finance Committee resolved, in the spring of 1790, to sell certain portions of the newly-acquired national property to the municipalities of Paris and other towns. These purchases were to be paid for in paper guaranteed by those bodies; such paper to have a legal circulation, and all anterior contracts to be liquidated in it. Such was the origin of the currency called *assignats*. The issue of these notes was at first regulated by the amount of property actually sold; but this precaution being subsequently neglected, naturally produced a rapid fall in the value of the new currency. One of the results of this financial measure was to convert a large proportion of mere country labourers into small landed proprietors. Ecclesiastics were now paid by the Government; the incomes of the higher dignitaries of the Church were reduced; while those of the *curés*, or parish priests, were augmented. In February 1790, monasteries were abolished and monastic vows suppressed.

These attacks upon the Church were soon followed by others upon the Parliaments. Alexander de Lameth proposed and carried a decree, November 3rd 1789, that the Parliaments should remain in vacation till further orders, and that meanwhile their functions should be discharged by the *Chambres des vacations*. Some of them endeavoured to resist, but were silenced by the As-

[44] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t iii. p. 16 sqq.

[45] Michelet, t. ii. p. 560 note.

[46] *Hist. Parl.* t. iii. p. 256.

sembly; and from this time they virtually ceased to exist, though not yet legally abolished.

We must here also record the reforms in the municipality of Paris, a body which played a leading part in the Revolution. By an ordinance of Louis XVI., April 13th 1789, Paris, which had hitherto consisted of twenty-one quarters, was, with a view to the elections for the States-General, divided into sixty *arrondissemens*, or districts; and this division was adopted as the basis of the first municipal organisation, established spontaneously after the taking of the Bastille. But as several of these districts had promoted disturbances, the Constituent Assembly, in order to break the concert between them, made a new division into forty-eight Sections, by a law of June 27th 1790. This arrangement, however, ultimately proved no better than the former one. It had been ordained that the Sections should not remain assembled after the elections of deputies were concluded; but this wise provision was rendered nugatory by another, authorising their assembly on the requisition of any eight of them. To exercise this right, a permanent committee of sixteen persons was established in each Section; and thus were provided forty-eight focuses of perpetual agitation; a circumstance which produced the most fatal effects upon the Revolution.[47]

Early in 1790 occurred the obscure plot of the Marquis de Favras, the object of which seems to have been to assassinate Lafayette and Necker, and to carry off the King to Peronne. The plot was to be carried out by means of 1200 horse, supported by an army of 20,000 Swiss and 12,000 Germans, and by raising several provinces; but it was detected. Favras was tried and condemned by the Châtelet, and hanged February 19th 1790, affording the first instance of the equality of punishments. Favras forbore to make any confessions, and the whole matter is involved in mystery.[48]

After the failure of the Orléans conspiracy, and the withdrawal of the Duke to England, Mirabeau, ever profligate and needy, finding all resources from that quarter cut off, determined on selling himself to the Court. He aimed at obtaining a seat in the

[47] See Mortimer Terneau, *Hist. de la Terreur*, t. i. p. 25 sqq. and note iii.

[48] See Toulongeon, t. i. p. 181. We must confess our inability to follow M. Louis Blanc's attempts to connect the Count of Provence and Mirabeau with this conspiracy. In support of his views, he adverts to a MS. letter of Monsieur in the possession of Mr. Monckton Milnes, addressed to some unknown person, and which, he thinks, was that found on Favras when arrested. (*Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 426.) But on referring to this letter, which M. Blanc gives at p. 169, we find that it is dated Nov. 1st 1790, and Favras was hanged in the preceding February.

Ministry, and, having procured an introduction to M. de Montmorin, one of the ministers (October 17th), he offered to manage the Assembly, which he called "a restive ass," in the interests of the Court. After this interview he appears to have received money from the King to pay part of his debts.[49] He drew up the scheme of a ministry, in which he himself was to be included; but his conduct had already begun to be suspected, and a motion was made and carried in the Assembly that no deputy should be capable of holding office.[50] Mirabeau, nevertheless, continued his connection with the Court, abandoned his former humble lodging, and set up a splendid establishment. His debts, amounting to 208,000 livres, were to be paid; he was to receive a monthly pension of 6000 livres; and, at the end of the session, if he had served the King well, a sum of one million livres. But, to insure his engagement for the payment of his debts, a kind of tutor was to be set over him; and a priest, M. de Fontanges, Archbishop of Toulouse, undertook this strange office![51]

It was resolved to celebrate the anniversary of the capture of the Bastille by a grand federative fête in the Champ de Mars, at which deputations from all the departments were to assist; and as the labour of 12,000 workmen sufficed not to prepare in time this vast amphitheatre, they were assisted by citizens of all ranks, ages, and sexes. A few score vagabond foreigners, headed by a half-crazed Prussian baron, styling himself Anacharsis Cloots, appeared at the bar of the National Assembly as "an embassy from all the nations of the universe," to demand places for a large number of foreigners desirous of assisting at the sublime spectacle of the Federation. This demand is said to have inspired the Assembly with profound enthusiasm, though many of the members could not refrain from laughter on perceiving among these ambassadors their discarded domestics, who, in dresses borrowed from the theatres and fripperies, personated, for twelve francs, Turks, Poles, Arabians, Chinese, and other characters. In the excitement of the moment, the Assembly decreed the abolition of all titles of honour, of armorial bearings, and liveries. A motion that the title of *Seigneur* should be retained by princes of the blood royal was opposed by Lafayette, and lost.[52]

On July 14th, the deputies from the eighty-three departments

[49] See *Corresp. entre le Comte de Mirabeau et le Comte de la Marck*, t. i. p. 387. The publication of this correspondence affords the most convincing proofs of Mirabeau's corruption.

[50] *Moniteur*, Séance de Nov. 7th 1789, ap. Blanc, t. iii. p. 401.

[51] *Correspondance, &c.*, t. i. p. 162 sqq.

[52] Toulongeon, t. i. p. 217 sq.; *Hist. Parl.* t. vi. p. 280 sqq.; Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 187 sqq.

ranged themselves under their respective banners, as well as the representatives of the army and of the National Guard. The Bishop of Autun officiated in pontifical robes at an altar in the middle of the arena; at each of its corners stood a hundred priests in their white *aubes*, with three-coloured girdles. The King and the President of the Assembly occupied, in front of the altar, thrones that had little to distinguish them from each other. Behind were their respective attendants, the members of the Assembly, and, in a sort of balcony, the Queen and Royal Family. Lafayette, as Commandant of the National Guard, first took the oath, next, the President of the Assembly, and then the King. His oath ran: "I, citizen, King of the French, swear to the nation to employ all the power delegated to me by the constitutional law of the State, to uphold the constitution, and enforce the execution of the laws." The Queen, lifting up the Dauphin in her arms, pledged his future obedience to the oath. The ceremony was concluded with a hymn of thanksgiving and the discharge of artillery. "Such," says a French historian, "was this memorable day, which, by its formalities, its grandeur and its simplicity, may be compared to anything that the majesty of the ancient republics has left us as a model."[53] A medal was struck in commemoration of the event, which was also celebrated by *fêtes* that lasted several days. Among the most remarkable of them was a ball in the ruins of the Bastille, in which former abode of grief and suffering might be read the inscription, *Ici l'on danse.*

But the nation thus newly constituted seemed already hastening to dissolution. All the springs of government appeared relaxed and distorted. Necker, disgusted at seeing his functions assumed by the Assembly, retired into Switzerland (September 1790). The communication in which he notified his retirement was received with coldness and silence; the deputies, with marked contempt, passed to the order of the day. It was evident that his public career was closed. The words *liberty* and *equality*, ill understood, had turned every head; had penetrated even into the army and filled it with insubordination. In some regiments the officers had been forced to fly, in others they had been massacred. In August a revolt of the troops stationed at Nanci had assumed a most serious character. General Bouillé was compelled to march against them from Metz, and the mutiny was not quelled without a sharp engagement and considerable bloodshed.

The Church was also in a state of disturbance. Not content with depriving the clergy of their property, the Assembly pro-

[53] Toulongeon, *Hist. de France*, t. i. p. 224.

ceeded to attack their consciences, by decreeing the civil constitution of the clergy, July 12th 1790, which abolished all the ancient forms and institutions of the Church. The title of *archbishop*, as well as all canonicates, prebends, chapters, priories, abbeys, convents, &c., were suppressed; bishops and *curés* were no longer to be nominated by the King, but to be chosen by the people. To these and other momentous changes in the constitution of the Church the Pope refused his sanction; yet, by a decree of November 27th 1790, the Assembly required the clergy to take an oath of fidelity to the nation, the law and the king, and to maintain the constitution. This oath they were to take within a week, on pain of deprivation. The King, before assenting to this measure, wished to procure the consent of the Pope, but was persuaded not to wait for it, and gave his sanction, December 3rd. Mirabeau, by an apparently violent speech against the clergy, was in reality endeavouring to please the court by procuring them a milder lot. Of 300 prelates and priests, who had seats in the Assembly, those who sat on the right unanimously refused to take the oath, while those who sat on the left anticipated the day appointed for that purpose. Out of 138 archbishops and bishops, only four consented to swear, Talleyrand, Loménie de Brienne (now Archbishop of Sens), the Bishop of Orléans, and the Bishop of Viviers. The oath was also refused by the great majority of the *curés* and vicars, amounting, it is said, to 50,000. Hence arose the distinction of *prêtres sermentés* and *insermentés*, or sworn and non-juring priests. The brief of Pius VI., forbidding the oath, was burnt at the Palais Royal, as well as a mannikin representing the Pope himself in his pontificals. Many of the deprived ecclesiastics refused to vacate their functions, declared their successors intruders and the sacraments they administered null, and excommunicated all who recognised and obeyed them.[54] Louis XVI., whose religious feelings were very strong, was perhaps more hurt by these attacks upon the Church than even by those directed against his own prerogative.

The death of Mirabeau, April 2nd 1791, was a great loss to the King, though it may well be doubted whether his exertions could have saved the monarchy. He fell a victim to his profligate habits, assisted probably by the violent exertions he had recently made in the Assembly, in a question concerning the private interests of his friend, the Count de la Marck.[55] He displayed his sensualism in

[54] Barruel, *Hist. du Clergé pendant la Révol.*, t. i. p. 61 sq.; Ferrières, *Mém.*, t. ii. liv. viii.; Bertrand de Moleville, *Annals, &c.*, t. iii. ch. 35.

[55] On returning to La Marck's house, he exclaimed, throwing himself on a sofa,

his last moments, by desiring the attendants to remove all the apparatus of a sick chamber, to bring perfumes and flowers, to dress his hair, to let him hear the harmonious strains of music. His treachery was not yet publicly known, and his death was honoured with all the marks of public mourning. The theatres were closed and all the usual entertainments forbidden. He was honoured with a sumptuous funeral at the public expense, to which, says a contemporary historian, nothing but grief was wanting.[56]. In fact, to most of the members of the Assembly, eclipsed by his splendid talents and overawed by his reckless audacity, his death was a relief. His remains were carried to the Pantheon, but were afterwards cast out to make room for those of Marat. After Mirabeau's death, Duport, Barnave, and Lameth reigned supreme in the Assembly, and Robespierre became more prominent.[57]

The King had now begun to fix his hopes on foreign intervention. The injuries inflicted by the decrees of the Assembly on August 4th 1789, on several princes of the Empire, through their possessions in Alsace, Franche Comté, and Lorraine, might afford a pretext for a rupture between the German Confederation and France. The Palatine House of Deux Ponts, the Houses of Würtemberg, Darmstadt, Baden, Salm Salm, and others had possessions and lordships in those provinces; and were secured in the enjoyment of their rights and privileges by the treaties which placed the provinces under the sovereignty of France. The German prelates, injured by the Civil Constitution of the clergy, were among the first to complain. By this act the Elector of Mentz was deprived of his metropolitan rights over the bishoprics of Strasburg and Spires; the Elector of Trèves of those over Metz, Toul, Verdun, Nanci, and St. Diez. The Bishops of Strasburg and Bâle lost their diocesan rights in Alsace.[58] Some of these princes and nobles had called upon the Emperor and the German body in January 1790, for protection against the arbitrary acts of the National Assembly. This appeal had been favourably entertained, both by the Emperor Joseph II. and by the King of Prussia; and though the Assembly offered suitable indemnities, they were haughtily refused. On the other hand, the Assembly having annulled seignorial rights and privileges throughout the French dominions, could not consistently make exceptions.[59] The

"Votre cause est gagnée, et moi je suis mort." See *Correspondance entre Mirabeau et La Marck*, t. iii p. 92 sq.

[56] Toulongeon, t i. p. 274.

[57] *Mémoires de Mirabeau*, t. viii. liv. x.; Lacretelle, *Hist. de France*, t. viii. p. 234.

[58] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 152 sq.

[59] *Mém. d'un Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 78 sq.

Emperor, besides the alarm which he felt in common with other absolute sovereigns at the French revolutionary *propaganda*, could not forget that the Queen of France was his sister; and he was also swayed by his minister, Prince Kaunitz, whose grand stroke of policy—an intimate alliance between Austria and the House of Bourbon—was altogether incompatible with the French Revolution. The Spanish and Italian Bourbons were naturally inclined to support their relative, Louis XVI. In October 1790, Louis had written to request the King of Spain not to attend to any act done in his name unless confirmed by letters from himself.[60] The King of Sardinia, connected by intermarriages with the French Bourbons, had also family interests to maintain. Catherine II. of Russia had witnessed, with humiliation and alarm, the fruits of the philosophy which she had patronised, and was opposed to the new order of things in France. The King of Prussia, governed by the counsels of Hertzberg, the inveterate enemy of Austria, though disposed to assist the French King, had at first insisted on the condition that Louis should break with Austria, and conclude an intimate alliance with the House of Brandenburg,[61] a proposition that was of course rejected. But in April 1791, Hertzberg retired from the Ministry, leaving the field open to Bischofswerder,[62] the friend of Austria, and the policy which had inspired the Convention of Reichenbach once more prevailed. Thus all the materials existed for an extensive coalition against French democracy.

In this posture of affairs the Count d'Artois, accompanied by Calonne, who served him as a sort of minister, and by the Count de Durfort, who had been despatched from the French Court, had a conference with the Emperor, now Leopold II., at Mantua, in May 1791, in which it was agreed that, towards the following July, Austria should march 35,000 men towards the frontiers of Flanders, the German Circles 15,000 towards Alsace; the Swiss 15,000 towards the Lyonnais; the King of Sardinia 15,000 towards Dauphiné; while Spain was to hold 20,000 in readiness in Catalonia. This agreement, for there was not, as some writers have supposed, any formal treaty, was drawn up by Calonne, and amended with the Emperor's own hand. But the large force to be thus assembled was intended only as a threatening demonstration, and

[60] *Homme d'état*, loc. cit.

[61] *Ibid.* p. 98 sq.

[62] Bischofswerder, and his brother mystics, or *illuminati*, exercised a great influence over the weak-minded Frederick William II. by their pretensions to supernatural power. Thus they pretended to evoke Jesus Christ and Moses, to show the shadow of Cæsar upon the wall, &c. Ségur, *Tableau Politique, &c.*, t. i. p. 82 sq.

hostilities were not to be actually commenced without the sanction of a congress.[63]

The flight attempted, a few weeks after, by Louis XVI., was not at all connected with this conference. Such a project was, indeed, mentioned at Mantua, but it was discouraged by the Emperor, as well as by the Count d'Artois and Calonne. The King's situation had now become intolerably irksome. He was, to all intents and purposes, a prisoner at Paris. A trip, which he wished to make to St. Cloud during the Easter of 1791, was denounced at the Jacobin Club as a pretext for flight; and when he attempted to leave the Tuileries, April 18th, the *tocsin* was rung, his carriage was surrounded by the mob, and he was compelled to return to the palace. On the following day Louis appeared in the Assembly, pointed out how important it was, on constitutional grounds, that his actions should be free; reiterated his assurances of attachment to public liberty and the new constitution, and insisted on his journey to St. Cloud. But the President was silent on this head, though the Assembly received the King with respect.[64]

A few days after thus protesting against the restraint to which he was subjected, the leaders of the Revolution, who appear to have suspected his negociations abroad, exacted that he should address a circular to his ambassadors at foreign courts, in which he entirely approved the Revolution, assumed the title of "Restorer of French liberty," and utterly repudiated the notion that he was not free and master of his actions.[65] The Powers to whom the note was addressed knew, however, perfectly well that he did not love the constitution; and, indeed, he immediately despatched secret agents to Cologne and Brussels with letters for the King of Prussia and for Maria Christina, governess of the Austrian Netherlands, in which he notified that any sanction he might give to the decrees of the Assembly was to be reputed null; that his pretended approval of the constitution was to be interpreted in an opposite sense, and that the more strongly he should seem to adhere to it, the more he should desire to be liberated from the captivity in which he was held.[66]

Louis soon after resolved on his unfortunate flight to the army of the Marquis de Bouillé at Montmédy. He appears to have been urged to it by the Baron de Breteuil, in concert with the

[63] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 110 sq.; Bertrand de Moleville, *Annals*, t. iv. ch. 11; Lacretelle, t. viii. p. 239 sqq.

[64] *Moniteur*, Séance du 19th Avril, 1791.

[65] The Circular dated April 23rd, 1791, is in the *Hist. Parl.* t. ix.

[66] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 106 sqq.

Count de Mercy, at Brussels, who falsely alleged that it was the Emperor's wish.[67] Marie Antoinette, as well as Bouillé, strongly opposed the project, but at last reluctantly yielded to the King's representations.[68]

Our limits will not permit us to enter into the interesting details of the flight to Varennes.[69] Suffice it to say, that having, after some hairbreadth escapes, succeeded in quitting Paris in a travelling berlin, June 20th, they reached St. Menehould in safety. But here the King was recognised by Drouet, the son of the post-master, who, mounting his horse, pursued the royal fugitives to Varennes, raised an alarm, and caused them to be captured when they already thought themselves out of danger. In consequence of their being rather later than was expected, the military preparations that had been made for their protection entirely failed. The news of the King's flight filled Paris with consternation. The Assembly assumed all the executive power of the Government, and when the news of the King's arrest arrived, they despatched Barnave, Latour, Maubourg, and Pétion to conduct him and his family back to Paris. In discharging this office, Pétion, who appears to have been a solemn coxcomb,[70] displayed a vulgar brutality, combined with insufferable conceit; while Barnave, touched by the affliction and bearing of the royal fugitives, won their confidence and regard by his considerate attention.[71] Notices had been posted up in Paris, that those who applauded the King should be horsewhipped, and that those who insulted him should be hanged; hence he was received on entering the capital with a dead silence. The streets, however, were traversed without accident to the Tuileries, but as the Royal party were alighting, a rush was made upon them by some ruffians, and they were with difficulty saved from injury. The King's brother, the Count of Provence, who had fled at the same time by a different route, escaped safely to Brussels.

[67] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 115.

[68] Weber, *Mém.*, t. ii. ch. iv. p. 315 sqq.; *Mém.* de Bouillé, ch. x. sq.

[69] One of the most authentic accounts of it will be found in Weber's *Mémoires*, t. ii. ch. iv., drawn up by M. de Fontanges, Archbishop of Toulouse, from information furnished by the Queen herself. The English reader will find an interesting narrative of it in Croker's *Essays on the French Revolution*, Essay iii.

[70] Pétion wrote an account of the journey back, which was found among his papers, and has been published by M. Mortimer Terneau, in his *Hist. de la Terreur*, t. i. note 5. Pétion is here condemned by his own mouth. Among other things he is vain and insolent enough to imagine that the princess Elizabeth had fallen in love with him during this miserable journey. M. Michelet had already alluded to this MS. *Hist. de la Révol.* t. iii. p. 41 note.

[71] That Barnave, however, as commonly related, was induced to change his politics during this journey, by the compassion which he felt for the Queen, is only a little piece of biographical effect. He had been going over several months before. *Lettres* de Montmorin, ap. Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 258, Anm.

This time the King's intention to fly could not be denied; he had, indeed, himself proclaimed it by sending to the Assembly a manifest, in which he explained his reasons for it, declared that he did not intend to quit the kingdom, expressed his desire to restore liberty and establish a constitution, but annulled all that he had done during the last two years. Amongst many well-founded complaints, he condescended to allude to his poverty, although he had a civil list of twenty-five millions, and of the inconvenience of the Tuileries, where, he said, he had not the comforts of a private person in easy circumstances.[72] The King, after his return, was provisionally suspended from his functions by a decree of the Assembly, June 25th. Guards were placed over him and the Queen; the gardens of the Tuileries assumed the appearance of a camp; sentinels were stationed on the roof of the Palace, and even in the Queen's bedchamber. Three commissaries, Tronchet, d'André, and Duport, were appointed to examine the King and Queen. The Duke of Orléans was talked of for Regent, but he repudiated the idea in a letter addressed to some of the revolutionary journals. Barnave, who had adopted the policy of Mirabeau, though with purer motives, namely, to arrest the Revolution, to save the monarchy, and govern in conjunction with the Queen,[73] suggested to Louis and Marie Antoinette what answers they should give to the questions put to them. While things were in this state the Marquis de Bouillé addressed a highly intemperate and injudicious letter to the Assembly, June 26th 1791, threatening that if the least harm was done to the King or Queen, he would conduct the army to Paris, and that not one stone of that city should be left upon another; but fortunately this effusion only excited the laughter of the deputies.[74]

[72] *Hist. Parl.* t. x. p. 269; cf. Michelet, t. iii. p. 19.

[73] Michelet, *Hist. de la Revol.*, t. iii. p. 179.

[74] Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 44 and App.

CHAPTER III.

From the period of the King's flight to Varennes must be dated the first decided appearance of a republican party in France. During his absence the Assembly had been virtually sovereign, and hence men took occasion to say, "You see the public peace has been maintained, affairs have gone on in the usual way in the King's absence."[1] The chief advocates of a republic were Brissot, Condorcet, and the recently-established club of the *Cordeliers*, so called from its meeting in a former convent of that order. This club, an offset from the Jacobins, contained all the most violent promoters of a revolution. Brissot began to disseminate republican opinions in his journal, and the arch-democrat, Thomas Payne, who was now at Paris, also endeavoured to excite the populace against the King. The Jacobin Club had not yet gone this length; they were for bringing Louis XVI. to trial and deposing him, but for maintaining the monarchy. Robespierre, a leading member of the club, who probably disliked to see the initiative taken by Condorcet and Brissot, in an equivocal speech supported the constitution.[2] In the Assembly, the Constitutionalists prevailed, who were both for upholding the monarchy and retaining Louis XVI. The Jacobins resolved to get up a petition to the Assembly, inviting them to suspend their decision till the eighty-three departments should have been consulted, well knowing that, from their numerous affiliations, a vote for the King's deposition would be carried. The leaders of the Constitutionalists, Lafayette, Barnave, Bailly, the Lameths, Duport and others, now separated from the Jacobins, and with their party, which included all the Members of the Assembly belonging to that club except ten or twelve, established the club of the *Feuillants*. This name was derived from their occupying an ancient convent of that order, founded by Henry III., an immense building in the Rue St. Honoré, facing the Place Vendôme, and adjoining on one side the *Manège*, where the Assembly sat, the terrace of the Feuillants, and the Tuileries.[3]

[1] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. i. p. 33.
[2] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. v. p 461.
[3] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. iii. p. 168.

The Jacobins gave notice to all the patriotic societies that their petition would be signed on the altar of the Federation in the Champ de Mars on July 17th. On the evening of the 16th, the Assembly, by decreeing that the Constitutional Charter, when finished, should be presented to Louis XVI. for acceptance, having implicitly pronounced his re-establishment, Camille Desmoulins and Marat openly incited the populace to acts of violence against the deputies. Marat pointed out by name Sieyès, Le Chapelier, Duport, Target, Thouret, Barnave, and others; and exhorted the people to empale them alive, and to expose their bodies three days on the battlements of the Senate House.[4] The Government gave notice that the proposed petition was illegal, and that the signing of it would be prevented by military force. Nevertheless, although the leading democrats, Danton, Fréron, Camille Desmoulins, Robespierre, Marat, had either withdrawn into the country or hidden themselves in Paris, a vast multitude congregated in the Champ de Mars on the 17th; and, as it was a Sunday, the crowd was augmented by many holiday folks, women, and children. A petition for the King's trial was drawn up and appears to have received many thousand signatures. Meanwhile martial law had been proclaimed; the national guards arrived, and having been assailed by the mob with volleys of stones, and even with pistol-shots, fired upon the people. Many persons were killed or wounded, and the crowd was dispersed. By this decisive act the Constitutionalists established for awhile their authority; but Lafayette and Bailly lost their popularity, and the Jacobins were not long in regaining their ascendancy.[5]

The Constitutional party, in absolving the King, appears to have been a good deal influenced by the attitude assumed at this time by foreign states, though this circumstance is ignored by the French historians of the Revolution. Several of the European Powers had begun to manifest a lively sympathy for Louis. Gustavus III. of Sweden, then at Aix-la-Chapelle, had made a vigorous declaration against the outrages to which the French King was subjected after his attempted flight, and had directed his ambassador to break off all intercourse with the ministers of the Assembly (June 27th 1791). Eight of the Swiss Cantons had forbidden their troops in the pay of France to take any oath except to Louis XVI. (July 4th). The King of Spain had addressed a memoir to the Assembly, calling upon it to respect Louis's dignity and liberty. The Emperor Leopold, on learning the capture of

[4] *L'Ami du peuple*, No. 514, ap. L. Blanc, t. v. p. 475.

[5] Ferrières, *Mém.*, t. iii. p. 70 sqq.

the French King, had addressed a circular letter from Padua, July 6th, to the principal sovereigns of Europe, calling upon them to demand his liberation, and to declare that they would avenge any further attempt on the freedom, honour, and safety of Louis, his Queen, and the royal family.[6] Many of the principal Courts declined to receive a French ambassador so long as the King should be under constraint.[7] The leaders of the Revolution appear to have made some military preparations to resist this dictation; but finding themselves unable to sustain a war, they resolved to avoid, or, at all events, to postpone it; a result to which the discordant views of the different parties contributed. It has even been affirmed that, towards the end of 1791, it might have been possible to regulate the political state of France by means of a Congress, aided by the Constitutional party.[8]

No sovereign was more zealous in Louis's cause than Frederick William II. of Prussia, who must be regarded as the very Agamemnon of the Coalition. After the French King's arrest, he despatched Bischofswerder to the Emperor in Italy, and a preliminary treaty between these two sovereigns was signed, July 25th, to be converted into a defensive alliance so soon as Austria should have concluded a peace with the Turks. The accession of the Czarina was expected; and in fact these events appear to have hastened the Peace of Galatz between Catherine and the Porte, August 11th. The impetuous Gustavus III. was for immediate action. He engaged to land 16,000 men at Ostend, requested George III. to furnish 12,000 Hanoverians, to be paid by the French princes, took Bouillé into his service, who pointed out how easily France might be invaded. The French Constitutionalists exerted themselves to avert an interference that would upset their whole policy. Barnave, Duport, and the Lameths addressed a letter to the Count d'Artois, begging him to return when the King should have accepted the Constitution; and it was forwarded to that prince by Louis's order, July 31st 1791. The

[6] It is said that at the date of this circular, a treaty for the partition of France was concluded between the Emperor, the King of Prussia, the King of Spain, and the emigrant French princes. The treaty is in Martens' *Recueil*, t. v. p. 5 (from the *Coll. of State Papers*); but it is very apocryphal; and still more so the pretended accession of Great Britain and Holland in March 1792. It was probably only a project, afterwards superseded by the Treaty of Vienna. Garden, t. v. p. 160 sq.

[7] Garden, *Ibid.*, p. 169. Austria and Prussia, in their joint note to the Danish Court, May 12th 1792, take credit for having procured the release of Louis in the preceding summer, as well as the establishment of his inviolability, and of a constitutional monarchy. *Ibid.* p. 211.

[8] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 116 sqq., 146, &c.

Constitutionalists also assured the Emperor that their object was to save the throne.[9]

At this juncture the Emperor, the King of Prussia, the Prince of Nassau, and the Count d'Artois, accompanied by Calonne and Bouillé, met at Pilnitz, a residence of the Elector of Saxony on the Elbe; where Leopold and Frederick William signed their celebrated DECLARATION OF PILNITZ, August 27th, calling on the other European Powers to aid them in enabling the King of France to establish, in perfect liberty, a monarchical government befitting alike his sovereign rights and the welfare of the French people. If this appeal should be accepted, their said majesties were determined to act promptly with their forces to accomplish the proposed end. In spite, however, of this Declaration, Leopold was not inclined for immediate action. In a private interview, he impressed upon Frederick William the difficulties of their undertaking, and the peril to which it would expose Louis XVI. and his Queen. The appeal to other Powers was an indefinite postponement of action; and such a declaration, unsupported by prompt and vigorous measures, was a mere *brutum fulmen*, fitted rather to irritate than to alarm the French.[10] England had at this period declared for a strict neutrality. Public opinion was against a war, and Pitt himself advocated the policy of non-intervention in Continental affairs.[11]

The labours of the Constituent Assembly were now drawing to a termination. On September 3rd 1791, the Act of the Constitution was presented to the King, who had been restored to the exercise of his functions. Louis notified his acceptance of it in a letter addressed to the Assembly, September 13th, and on the following day he appeared in the Chamber to confirm it with an oath. The new Constitution was as liberal as the French might reasonably have desired; but as it lasted scarcely a year it is not necessary to enter into any lengthened examination of it. Its chief, and, it may be added, its most lasting merit was the destruction of ancient abuses. Feudalism and its exclusive privileges were abolished; the abuses which spring from an arbitrary government, such as *lettres de cachet*, &c., were reformed; uniformity of taxation was established, and the power of the purse vested in the representatives of the people; the monopolies of trading corporations; *maîtrises* and *jurandes*, as well as *corvées* and all the fetters which

[9] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 118 sqq.; Bouillé, *Mém.*, ch. xii. p. 274; *Corr. entre Mirabeau et la Marck*, t. iii. p. 163 sqq.; L. Blanc, t. v. p. 29.

[10] *Homme d'état*, t. i. pp. 137, 143.

[11] *Diaries and Correspondence of the Earl of Malmesbury*, vol. ii. p. 441.

paralyse manufacture and agriculture, were suppressed; the admission to civil offices and military commands was thrown open; the freedom of religious worship recognised; barbarous punishments were done away with; juries introduced in place of the suppressed Parliaments, and, in short, all the English forms of administering justice adopted. Nor must we forget among the labours of the Constituent Assembly the division of France into departments, and the establishment of the National Guard. But there were some things which they had done, and others which they had omitted to do, which rendered nugatory all their labours. They had, indeed, recognised an hereditary monarchy, and declared the person of the King inviolable; but they had not given him the means of maintaining himself on the throne; they had stripped him of his prerogatives, deprived him of the support of the clergy and nobles, placed him face to face with a wild democracy, and established no strong executive power which might control its excesses. Of the fall of their new Constitution by democratic violence they seem to have entertained no fear. The apprehensions of the Assembly, as well as of the people, were directed only against the aristocracy; whence an able writer on the Revolution has drawn a proof "how wretched and how oppressive had been the ancient government, with its own abuses, and the abuses of the aristocracy, when men seemed to have no terror but of its return." [12]

The annexation of Avignon and the Venaissin to France was among the last acts of the Constituent Assembly (September 14th 1791). Avignon and its territory had been a possession of the See of Rome ever since the sale of it to the Pope by Joanna, Queen of Naples and Countess of Provence, in 1348: But the existence of a foreign colony in the heart of France was a source of much inconvenience; it became the refuge of the disaffected and the entrepôt of the smuggler. A party in Avignon, favourable to the Revolution, had risen in June 1790, and solicited its union with France; formidable riots had occurred, much blood had been spilt, and many atrocities committed. The Assembly, says Toulongeon, after discussing the diplomatic titles and treaties which assured the sovereignty to the Popes, was naturally led by its principles to the *original title*, which gives a people, when its will is unequivocally pronounced, a right to change its government.[13] The people of Avignon do not, however, appear to have been altogether so unanimous. Within a month after the annexation, the Papal party rose, but were put down by the horrible

[12] Smyth, *Lectures on the French Revolution*, vol. ii. p. 10.
[13] *Hist. de France*, t. i. p. 243.

massacres in the tower called *La Glacière*—a foretaste of the horrors which ensued in France.

The Act of the Constitution having been proclaimed with great pomp, September 18th, the Assembly declared its labours terminated and the Revolution accomplished. Such were their security and foresight! The Chamber was closed September 30th. As the members were departing, the populace crowned Robespierre and Pétion with garlands of oak-leaves and carried them home in triumph. Robespierre was now very popular, and had latterly enjoyed a large share of influence in the Assembly. It was on his motion that they had passed a sort of self-denying ordinance by which they had declared themselves ineligible to the Assembly that was to succeed them (May 16th). He had also procured a decree, April 7th, only a few days after the death of Mirabeau, that no member of the Assembly should become a minister within four years after the conclusion of the session.[14] Both these measures were carried by acclamation. The royalists and aristocrats hoped that an entirely new Assembly might undo all that had been done; while some were moved by that false generosity which led the public men of France to abandon what seemed for their own private advantage without considering whether or not it was for the public good; some by pique and personal resentment, the despair of seeing themselves again returned, and the desire to reduce others to their own level; a few from deeper and more designing motives. By their assent to these acts, Barnave, Duport, the Lameths, and the whole Constitutional party, pronounced their own political annihilation; and such was doubtless Robespierre's design. It is true that by the same act he excluded himself; but he knew full well that the real power of the state lay not so much in the National Assemblies, as in the Paris mob and the Jacobins who directed it, among whom he was a ruling power.

Louis XVI. sent a notification to foreign Powers of his acceptance of the Constitution. Russia, Sweden, and Spain refused to receive it; the emigrant French princes drew up a protest against it. Russia and Sweden, which Powers had in vain endeavoured to excite the Emperor to action, concluded an alliance at Drotningholm, October 19th 1791, the secret articles of which related to the affairs of France; and sent ambassadors to the princes at Coblenz.[15] The Emperor, on the contrary, in pursuance of his pacific policy, not only accepted Louis's act, but thought, or

[14] See *Hist. Parl.* t. ix. p. 318, t. x. p. 25.

[15] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 169 sq.; *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 163.

pretended to think, that it might serve to re-establish order in France.[16] Hence he made it a pretext for inaction; and the King of Prussia followed his example.

The new Chamber, which opened its sittings October 1st 1791, assumed the title of the National Legislative Assembly. It was far from being composed of such distinguished men as had sat in the Constituent. France had exhausted her best talent, and, by Robespierre's self-denying ordinance, had also deprived herself of the services of men who had acquired some political experience. The new deputies were mostly young men of the middle class. The aristocrats sneeringly observed that they could not muster among them 300,000 livres of income from landed and other property. The right of the Legislative Assembly was composed of the *Feuillant* party, whose principles were represented by the club already mentioned. The centre consisted of moderate men attached to the new constitution. The left was chiefly formed by the party called Girondists, so named from the twelve deputies of the Gironde, for the most part lawyers and men of talent, natives of Bordeaux and the southern provinces. The three most distinguished and eloquent members of this deputation were Vergniaud, Guadet, and Gensonné. The Girondists, however, were also joined by deputies from other parts, as Brissot, Condorcet, Rabaud St. Etienne, Pétion, and others; and hence their party is also sometimes called Brissotins. On the left sat also a still more democratic faction, led by such men as Chabot, Bazire, and Merlin. At the first sitting of the new Assembly, the Book of the Constitution was solemnly presented to it by the Archivist and twelve of the oldest members of the Constituent Assembly; when the deputies took an oath to observe it and to live as freemen or to die.

The Constitutional party, however, were now fast declining. Besides the loss of their parliamentary influence, they were also deprived of municipal power and the command of the armed force. The functions of Lafayette as commandant of the National Guard had been suppressed by a decree of September 12th; and Bailly, alarmed at his retirement, resigned the mayoralty. Lafayette aspired to succeed him, but found a competitor in Pétion. Lafayette's reputation with the people was of that equivocal sort which, in a momentous crisis, must always attach to a man who takes no very decided part; while Pétion was at this period the idol of the people, and was also supported by the Court, which hated Lafayette, and had taken a just view of Pétion's calibre and incapacity.[17] The

[16] See his note, ap. *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 157.
[17] Bertrand de Moleville, *Mémoires*.

election of Pétion by a large majority was a triumph for the Gironde. Soon afterwards, Manuel was appointed *Procureur de la Commune*, with Danton as substitute. A change of ministry also took place in October. Montmorin resigned the portfolio of foreign affairs, and was succeeded by De Lessart; Bertrand de Moleville became minister of marine, and Count de Narbonne, the friend, some say something more, of Madame de Staël, succeeded Duportail as minister of war. This cabinet is thought to have been a good deal inspired by Madame de Staël.

Among the more important questions that first engaged the attention of the Legislative Assembly, was that of the emigration. The number of emigrants was increasing every day; 1900 officers had quitted the army, and crossed the frontiers.[18] Monsieur, by his flight, drew many nobles after him, who should have remained in France, and rallied round the throne. He now took the lead of the emigration instead of his brother, the Count d'Artois; a kind of little court gathered round him at Coblenz, which place became the head-quarters of the emigration. The Emperor Leopold discountenanced them. He even punished some Brabanters who had insulted the French national cockade, and he forbade all assemblies of the emigrants within his dominions, even without arms.[19] The King of Prussia followed his example. The Elector of Trèves alone openly favoured the emigrants. The Assembly voted a Proclamation, October 31st, requiring the King's eldest brother, Louis Stanislas Xavier, to return to France within two months; or, in default, to forfeit his eventual title to the regency. On the 9th of November, they declared all emigrants whatsoever suspected of conspiracy, and liable to the punishment of death, with confiscation of their properties, if they remained assembled together after January 1st 1792.[20] The King wrote to his brothers ordering them to return; but they made a flippant answer. Louis sanctioned the decree against his brother, but put his *veto* on that of November 9th.

The Emperor, although he discouraged the emigrants, and seemed to respect the new French constitution, ratified a very energetic *conclusum* of the Diet of Ratisbon against the decrees of August 4th 1789; and on December 3rd 1791, he addressed a letter to Louis XVI., in which he expressed his determination to support the claims of the injured German princes having possessions in Lorraine and Alsace.[21] To parry this stroke, and detach the Prussian Court from the Austrian alliance, Count Ségur was sent

[18] Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 95.
[19] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 167.
[20] *Hist. Parl.* t. xii. p. 218 sqq.
[21] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 169.

to Berlin, with instructions to bribe the King's ministers and mistresses; but the nature of his mission transpired, and Frederick William II. gave him a very freezing reception.[22] Louis XVI. wrote to the Elector of Trèves and other German princes, December 20th, declaring that he should regard them as enemies, if they encouraged the assembling of emigrants; while the Emperor, on his side, announced that he had instructed General Bender to assist the Elector, if his territories should be invaded; on condition, however, that he had fulfilled his engagement to disperse the emigrants.[23] Under these threatening aspects, the French ministry ordered three armies of 150,000 men in all to be formed, to be commanded respectively by Generals Rochambeau, Luckner, and Lafayette. The Girondists, and especially Brissot, Gensonné, and Isnard, were at this time using every endeavour to excite a war by their inflammatory speeches. On January 1st 1792, the Assembly decreed the accusation of Monsieur, the Count d'Artois, the Prince of Condé, Calonne, and a few others,[24] and by a resolution of January 25th, they invited the King to demand of the Emperor his intentions, and to call upon him to renounce all treaties and conventions directed against the sovereignty, independence, and security of the French nation. His refraining to answer before March 1st was to be considered equivalent to a declaration of war. The news of this proceeding excited the Emperor's anger. He now converted the preliminary treaty with Prussia of July 25th 1791, into a definitive alliance by the Treaty of Berlin, February 7th 1792;[25] he gave orders for the formation of a *corps d'armée* in Bohemia, and marched 6000 men into the Breisgau. The orders given to Bender were justified; complaints were made of the captivity in which the French King, the Emperor's brother-in-law, was held, and of the anarchy in France; and all these misfortunes were imputed to the pernicious sect of the Jacobins.[26] This reply was received by the Assembly with insult and derision. The death of Leopold II. (March 1st), arrested for a while the proceedings of the Coalition; which was also weakened by the assassination of Gustavus III. of Sweden, a fortnight afterwards: an event hailed with joy by the Girondists and Jacobins. The brother of Gustavus, Regent during the minority of his nephew, Gustavus IV., determined to observe the strictest neutrality; and Spain seemed

[22] *Homme d'état*, p. 184 sqq.

[23] *Souvenir* de M. Dumas, t. ii. p. 47, ap. Blanc, t. v. p. 253.

[24] *Hist. Parl.* t. xiii. p. 13.

[25] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v, p. 5, and the *Suppl.* t. ii. p. 172.

[26] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 232 sqq. According to Madame de Staël, *Considérations, &c.*, partie iii. ch. 5, this note had been drawn up by Barnave and Duport, the secret counsellors of the Queen, and by her transmitted to Leopold.

to incline the same way, after the Count d'Aranda became prime minister.[27] The correspondence with the Emperor led to a change of ministry in France. De Lessart, the foreign minister, was impeached for having concealed the real state of affairs; Narbonne had already been dismissed; and the Girondists achieved a triumph by forcing on the Court a ministry selected from their own party. These men had already begun to display the violence of their principles. Vergniaud, in accusing the minister, had not obscurely threatened some of the royal family with death; and his words had been greeted with thunders of applause.[28] The Gironde now imposed Dumouriez on the King as foreign minister; Roland was made minister of the interior; Lacoste was appointed to the marine in place of Bertrand de Moleville; Clavière to the finances, Duranton to the department of justice.

The most remarkable of the new ministers were Dumouriez and Roland, the latter, however, chiefly through his extraordinary wife. Roland himself is a good specimen of the talking, scribbling, philosophical, and factious Girondists. He had dissipated in his youth the greater part of his patrimony, and at the mature age of fifty-eight he married Manon Jeanne Phlipon, the daughter of an engraver on the Quai des Lunettes. Handsome, clever, inquisitive, self-educated, Manon had devoured, but without judgment or selection, a vast quantity of books; had studied by turns Jansenius and Pascal, Descartes and Malebranches, Voltaire and the Encyclopædists; and had been alternately a Jansenist, a Cartesian, and a Deist. The reading of Plutarch, whose works she took to church instead of the *Semaine Sainte*, had made her, at an early period, an ardent Republican, and her chief regret was not to have been born a citizen of Athens, Sparta, or Rome. These somewhat unfeminine studies and aspirations were not unnaturally accompanied with little of the gentleness of her sex. Her letters show her more fierce and uncompromising than many of the male leaders of the Revolution.[29] But she had great talent and a ready pen; she shared the official labours of her husband, wrote many of his papers, and became the very soul of the Gironde.

The Girondists were thus masters of the government, but

[27] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 180 and 219.

[28] "Que tous ceux qui habitent le palais sachent que le roi seul est inviolable, que la loi y atteindra sans distinction tous les coupables, et qu'il n'y a pas une tête qui convaincue d'être criminelle, puisse échapper à son glaive." *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 397 sqq. Cf. L. Blanc, t. vi. p. 296.

[29] She had so far outstripped the Revolution, that in a letter, written soon after the taking of the Bastille, she urged in obscene language either the trial and execution of the King and Queen, or their assassination. See Croker, *Essays on Fr. Revol.*, p. 175 sq.

unfortunately not of the Jacobins. In fact their advancement to the ministry produced an open breach between them and Robespierre, the Jacobin leader, who was jealous at seeing all place and power in their hands. The Girondists, on their side, dreaded Robespierre's influence with the people; and on April 25th 1792, Brissot and Guadet, two leading members of the Assembly, denounced him to the Jacobin Club as an agitator. But Robespierre made a triumphant defence in a speech that was much applauded, and which is also remarkable as giving the first indications of his system of blood and terror. He conjured the Brissotins to unite with him against the common enemy, and to cause the sword of the executioner to move horizontally, so as to strike off the heads of all the conspirators against liberty.[30]

Francis, who at the age of twenty-four succeeded to the Austrian hereditary dominions on the death of Leopold II., adopted his father's policy with regard to France; though, not having been yet elected Emperor, he was under no obligation to support the cause of the German princes. One of the first acts of his reign was to assure the King of Prussia of his adherence to the principles of the recent alliance. Frederick William was ardently inclined to co-operate in the deliverance of Louis XVI. and his restoration to his former power. This enthusiasm, however, was not shared by his cabinet, nor by the Duke of Brunswick, one of his principal advisers. The views of Prussian statesmen were now directed towards a second partition of Poland. If they were inclined to assist the King of France, it was only in compliance with the wishes of the Czarina, who had made it a condition of admitting Prussia to a share of the Polish spoils. Catherine II. had exhibited a violent animosity against the French Revolution, which was, perhaps, partly sincere, but which was also suspected of originating in a desire to facilitate her views upon Poland, by despatching to a distance the armies of Austria and Prussia. The Prussian statesmen and the Duke of Brunswick regarded consequently the expedition against France as a mere military promenade to satisfy the Empress, in which nothing was to be gained for Prussia, and in which therefore as little as possible was to be ventured; a disposition which will help to account for the little energy with which the campaign of 1792 was prosecuted by the Duke of Brunswick,[31] In some negociations which ensued with M. de Noailles at Vienna, Prince Kaunitz laid down as points from which Austria could not depart: 1st, the satisfaction of the German princes for their

[30] *Mém. de Wéber*, ch. v. p. 322; Croker, *Essays*, p. 335 sqq.
[31] *Homme d'état*, t. i. pp. 285, 354 sq.

possessions in Alsace and Lorraine; 2nd, the satisfaction of the Pope for the county of Avignon; 3rd, such measures as France might think proper to take, but which should be such that the government should be sufficiently strong to repress everything calculated to disturb other states.[32] These demands were ill received. The Girondists, especially Brissot and Dumouriez, were for an immediate appeal to arms, and compelled the King to proceed to the Assembly, April 20th, and to declare war against his nephew, Francis I., King of Hungary and Bohemia, which he did with a trembling voice and evident reluctance. But the announcement was hailed with enthusiasm by the French nation.

At this time the French army of the North, numbering about 50,000 men, under Marshal Rochambeau, was cantoned between Dunkirk and Philippeville. The army of the Centre, under Lafayette, which was rather stronger, stretched from Philippeville to Weissemburg; while that of the Rhine, about 40,000 men, under Luckner, was posted between Weissemburg and Basle. The frontier of the Alps and the Pyrenees was confided to the care of General Montesquiou; but this quarter was not yet threatened. Dumouriez, who had sent secret agents into Belgium to excite the Brabanters to revolt, determined on taking the offensive; and he ordered columns of attack from the armies of Rochambeau and Lafayette to be rapidly directed on different parts of Belgium, in the hope that the inhabitants would rise and aid the invasion. But in this he was disappointed. The leading columns, which were too weak, advanced as far as Lille and Valenciennes; but although there was only a small Austrian force at present in the Low Countries, they fled in a panic at the first sight of the enemy, April 28th; and Lafayette, who had advanced to Bouvines, was compelled by their flight also to retire. The retreating troops fired on their officers, and massacred General Dillon and other of their commanders. Rochambeau was now superseded by Luckner, and the French army stood on the defensive.

This reverse, which was imputed to treachery, excited great distrust and suspicion at Paris, and increased the dissensions between the Feuillants and the Girondists. The Assembly declared itself *en permanence*, and seized the whole management of affairs. The Girondist faction had begun a course of policy which was highly distasteful not only to the King but also to Dumouriez. They had denounced what they called an *Austrian Committee*, or a conspiracy of the Court with the Coalition. They had carried a

[32] *Hist. Parl.* t. xiv. p. 26; *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 322.

decree forbidding ecclesiastics to appear in public in their costume. They had obtained the dismissal of the King's guard of 12,000 men, and sent their commander, the Duke de Brissac, a prisoner to Orleans. They had procured a decree for the transportation of priests who refused to take the civic oath (May 24th). And on June 4th, Servan, the new minister of war, without saying a word to his colleagues in the council, suddenly proposed to the Assembly to form a federal army of 20,000 men, selected from all the departments of France, to be encamped on the north side of Paris; and the Assembly had decreed the measure on the 8th.[33]

The King could not help showing his aversion to these measures, and he refused to sanction the decrees of May 24th and June 8th for the banishment of the priests and the establishment of a federal army. Roland now addressed to him his famous letter, written by his wife, exhorting Louis to put himself at the head of the Revolution.[34] But it only confirmed the King in his intention to break with the Gironde; and on June 13th Servan, Roland, and Clavière were dismissed. Two days afterwards Dumouriez also resigned, being offended at the coldness and disdain with which the King treated him. Of the Girondist ministry only Lacoste and Duranthon were retained; and the places of the others were supplied by persons of no note, selected from the Feuillant party.

Lafayette at this crisis, by an ill-judged attempt to support the Constitutional monarchy, addressed a dictatorial letter to the Legislative Assembly from his camp at Maubeuge (June 16th), in which he denounced the Jacobin faction, demanded the suppression of the clubs, and exhorted the Assembly to rally round a Constitutional throne.[35] This imprudent step gave the finishing blow to Lafayette's reputation as a patriot, and helped to prepare the insurrection of June 20th and August 10th. None had hitherto been admitted into the national guard except those who could provide their own uniform and equipments, a regulation which had kept the force in some degree select; but now it was ordered that pikes should take rank with bayonets, and that all who presented themselves should be admitted to serve. The sixty battalions were also reduced to forty-eight, the number of the new sections; which served to create a fresh mixture of the men, and still further to destroy Lafayette's influence over them.[36]

It must be borne in mind that, besides the quarrel of the Gironde with the King, a struggle for power was now going on

[33] *Séance* du 4 Juin, 1792, *Hist. Parl.* t. xiv. p. 419.

[34] It will be found in the *Mémoires* de Madame Roland, t. i. App. C.

[35] *Hist. Parl.* t. xv. p. 69 sqq.

[36] Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 160 sq.

between Robespierre and the former party. The measures of the Girondists just described, the persecution of the priests, the raising of a federal army, even the declaration of war against Austria, were bids for mob popularity; and they were now contriving how they might regain power by means of an insurrection. Robespierre, irritated at seeing his functions taken out of his hands, denounced the Girondists as "hypocrites of liberty," inveighed in the Jacobin Club, June 13th, against any partial insurrections, as calculated only to weaken the popular cause; sent Chabot and others into the Faubourg St. Antoine to persuade the inhabitants to confine themselves to a simple petition in favour of the decrees of May 24th and June 8th; exhorted them to await the expected arrival of the Marseillese, and not to rise till the decisive moment had come for overturning the throne.[37] He thus affected moderation in order to annoy his adversaries. He even started a journal called *Le défenseur de la Constitution*, which he made a vehicle for attacking the Girondists,[38] and in which he vehemently denounced their contemplated insurrection.

Most historians have considered the insurrection of June 20th 1792, the anniversary of the oath at the Tennis-Court, as the immediate response of the people to the King's refusal to sanction the two decrees, and the dismissal of the Girondist ministers; but it had, in fact, been prepared some time before.[39] The "recall of the good ministers" was, however, made its watchword. Danton seems to have been the chief mover in it; Pétion, divided between hope and fear, only gave it his connivance.[40] The rumours of it had filled the royal family with alarm, and the King had deposited copies of his will with three notaries. On the whole, however, it was a more peaceable and good-humoured mob than might have been expected. The petitioners, as they called themselves, consisted of some 8000 men armed with pikes and other weapons, and were accompanied by a large crowd of unarmed persons. One fellow, indeed, carried on a pike a calf's heart, with the inscription, "heart of an aristocrat," and there were other menacing emblems, but intermixed with peaceable ones, such as ears of corn,

[37] *Deposition of Chabot* before Revol. Tribunal, *Hist. Parl.*, t. xxx. p. 40.

[38] See Croker, *Essays, &c.*, p. 182 sqq. The first number of the *Défenseur* appeared in May 1792; the twelfth and last, Aug. 10th. "Every line of it shows," says Mr. Croker, "that in the self-denying ordinance, nothing was further from Robespierre's intention than any self-sacrifice." (*Ibid.* p. 339.) After Robespierre's election to the Convention, he continued this Journal under the title of *Lettres à ses Constituants.*

[39] Mortimer Terneau, *Hist. de la Terreur*, t. i. p. 129.

[40] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. iii. p. 465 sq.

green boughs, and nosegays. Led by Santerre and St. Huruge, they were permitted to defile through the Chamber of the Assembly, singing *Ça ira*, dancing, and shouting *Vive la nation! Vivent les sans-culottes! À bas le veto!*

From the Assembly the mob proceeded to the Tuileries. The King displayed great firmness during this terrible visit. He ordered the doors to be thrown open, advanced to meet the crowd, asked them what they wanted, observed that he had not violated the Constitution. He then retired into the embrasure of a window, surrounded by a few faithful attendants. When the people urged him to sanction the two decrees, he replied: "This is not the time nor the place." To their demands that he should recall his ministers, he merely answered, "I shall do what the Constitution directs." He put on a *bonnet rouge* thrust towards him on a pike; but with the exception of a brutal and insulting speech from the butcher Legendre, afterwards a notorious member of the Convention, and the attack of a ruffian who menaced him with a pike, but was hindered from doing any mischief, no further violence occurred. After this scene had lasted two hours, Pétion, the mayor, arrived, and with the assistance of the deputies, Vergniaud and Isnard, persuaded the mob to depart. The King's sister, the Princess Elizabeth, had stood by his side the whole time. A scene somewhat similar passed in the Queen's apartments. Here Santerre the brewer took upon himself the office of master of the ceremonies, and as the crowd defiled through the room, pointed out to them Marie Antoinette and her son, observing "This is the Queen, this is the Prince Royal!" Both the Queen and her son put on the *bonnet rouge*. Napoleon Bonaparte, then a young officer, who was a spectator of this scene from the gardens of the Tuileries, exclaimed, "The wretches! 400 or 500 should be shot, and the rest would soon take to flight!"[41]

Thus the insurrection of June 20th proved a failure, and had rather the effect of giving the King a little brief popularity. But Lafayette, by another ill-judged, though well-meant step, contrived to make matters worse. On June 28th he suddenly appeared in the Assembly, demanded the punishment of the rioters and the suppression of the Jacobin Club. Failing in this quarter, he sought to effect his objects by means of the national guard, and attempted a review of them in the Champ de Mars, which was forbidden by Pétion. Lafayette now proposed to aid the King's flight to Compiègne, and place him at the head of the army; should that fail, that Luckner and himself should march on Paris

[41] Bourienne, *Mémoires*, t. i. ch. iv.

with their forces. But Marie Antoinette opposed these projects, observing that, if Lafayette was to be their only resource, they had better perish.[42] The Queen also possibly knew what the result showed, that the army would not have followed Lafayette. His ill-judged protection only served to rally all parties more violently against the throne. He was attacked in the journals, denounced in the Assembly, burnt in effigy by the Jacobins, and compelled to quit Paris. The Feuillant Club was now closed; the grenadier companies and chasseurs of the national guard, who had displayed some loyalty, were cashiered; the soldiers of the line were removed from the capital.

The refusal of Lafayette's aid sprang, no doubt, in a great degree from hatred of him, as one of the earliest promoters of the Revolution. But a proposal of the Duke de la Rochefoucauld Liancourt, commandant of Rouen, whose troops were devoted to him, that the King should fly to that city, was also refused; and hence we are led to the conclusion that the Court, at this juncture, relied on the invasion of the allied Powers for their deliverance in preference to venturing on a civil war. The failure of the French troops, in their first encounters with the enemy, was calculated to nourish this hope. This view is confirmed by the fact that the King had now entered into secret negociations with the Coalition, and by the advice of M. Malouet, had sent Mallet du Pan to treat with the allied sovereigns. A memoir was drawn up for this purpose from the King's instructions by Mallet du Pan, and corrected with Louis's own hand.[43] The very first sentence of this document expresses that a counter-revolution was contemplated; a project for which the insurrection of June 20th, to which it alludes, can alone afford the King some justification. The paper sets out with a description of parties in France. The Girondists, as well as the other section of the Jacobins, are denounced as virtually republicans, though the Girondists would leave a sort of nominal monarchy. The other two parties, the *Feuillants*, or Constitutionalists, and the *Indépendants*, or Neutrals, are spoken of with contempt. The King congratulates himself on the foreign war, as destined to effect all that could have been hoped from a civil war, with less peril, misfortune and uncertainty.[44] The main object of the Memoir is to inform the

[42] Lally Tollendal's *Letter to the King*, *Hist. Parl.*, t. xvii. p. 243 sqq.; Madame Campan, *Memoirs*, vol. ii. ch. ix. (Engl. Transl.)

[43] It will be found in *Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. i.; *Pièces Justif.*, p. 427 sqq. It was first published by Professor Smyth, in his *Lectures on the Fr. Revol.*, t. ii. p. 245 sqq.

[44] "Mais la guerre extérieure, dont la Providence a inspiré la déclaration aux factieux, est destinée à faire maintenant avec moins de périls, de malheurs, et d'incertitude, ce qu'on pourrait espérer de la

allied sovereigns of the manner in which the King wished the counter-revolution to be effected. It is strongly impressed upon them that the war should have as much as possible the appearance of a *foreign* war, and that the emigrants should not take any active and offensive part in it. Mallet du Pan had an interview at Frankfort, in July, with the ministers of the Courts of Vienna and Berlin, who were in the suite of the King of Hungary and Bohemia. That sovereign had been elected Emperor of Germany, July 5th, with the title of Francis II.; and on the 11th he had entered Frankfort in state, accompanied by the Empress, the Archduke Joseph, and a brilliant court, for the ceremony of his coronation.

After the insurrection, and the attempt of Lafayette, the leaders of the Gironde began to declaim violently against the King. All Paris seemed moved with a patriotic phrensy. Lamourette having exhorted the Assembly to have but one soul, the members of the right and left rushed into one another's arms and hugged each other in a fraternal embrace: next day they were greater enemies than ever. On the motion of Hérault de Sechelles a decree was passed, July 11th, that "the country is in danger."[45] The day before all the ministers had resigned, an act that produced no impression. Their places were filled up by unimportant persons.

As the King had put his *veto* on the decree summoning the federal volunteers to Paris, another had been passed appointing Soissons as the place of the federal camp; and to this he gave his sanction. The troops were first to visit the capital, to participate in the anniversary fête of the Federation which was now approaching. The Jacobins of Brest and Marseilles were most active in forwarding these men. Marseilles especially, besides isolated bands, sent three regular battalions, in February, July, and October 1792, the first of which was led by Barbaroux. The Mayor of Marseilles had addressed them, on their departure, with these execrable words: "You are going to Paris to combat the tyrant; his head will be your victory, his head will be your recompense!"[46] These men, though called Marseillese, were, for the most part, the scum of the prisons of Italy and the Mediterranean coasts.[47] They sang the well-known hymn, composed at Strasburg by Rouget de l'Isle, an officer of engineers, but first published at Marseilles, and thence called the *Marseillaise*.[48]

guerre civile." *Mém. et Corr., &c.*, t. i. p. 440.

[45] *Hist. Parl.* t. xv. p. 358 sq.

[46] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 417.

[47] Blanc Gilli, *Réveil d'alarme*, ap. Barbaroux, p. 40 note; cf. Terneau, t. ii. p. 142.

[48] See Lautard, Marseilles depuis 1789

On July 14th, the fête of the Federation, the Champ de Mars was covered with eighty-three tents, one for each department. In the centre rose a symbolical tomb for those who should die on the frontiers, with the inscription: "*Tremblez, tyrans, nous les vengerons.*" Behind the altar of the country was a tree, called the "tree of feudality," from the branches of which hung bucklers, casques, escutcheons, crowns, tiaras, cardinals' hats, ermined mantles, &c. After taking the oath to the Constitution at the altar, the King was invited to set fire to this tree, but excused himself on the ground that feudalism no longer existed.[49] This was the last time that he appeared in public. Pétion, who had been suspended from his office of Mayor, for his conduct on June 20th, by the superior authority of the Directory of the Department of Paris,[50] was now reinstated in his functions.

Amid these somewhat melodramatic displays the French showed no lack of patriotism and constancy in the imminent danger with which they were threatened. The armies of the Coalition were now collecting on the frontiers of France, under the command-in-chief of the Duke of Brunswick, a prince of mature years, the companion in arms of Frederick the Great, and enjoying a high reputation both for military and other talent. The Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, William IX., through whose dominions the march of the Prussians lay, and whose geographical position was incompatible with neutrality in a war between Prussia and France, had joined the Coalition. The Electors of Trèves and Mentz had done the same. The Circles of Suabia had also consented to furnish their contingents as states of the Empire. The Electors of Hanover and Saxony had declared themselves neutral. The Elector of Bavaria also contrived to maintain his neutrality till the spring of 1793; when, at the urgent remonstrance of the Imperial Court, he found himself compelled to add his contingent of 8000 men to the combined army.[51] The Austrian and Prussian Cabinets had invoked the aid of the Danish Court, in a joint note, dated May 12th 1792, in which the principal motives alleged for interfering in the affairs of France were her revolutionary propagandism and the violence exercised towards the King. But the Danish minister, Count Bernstorff, declined to interfere, on the ground that

jusqu'en 1815, t. i. p. 133, ap. Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 221. Cf. *Chronique de Paris*, in *Hist. Parl.*, t. xvii. p. 205. "Les Marseillais," says this Chronicle, "le chantent avec beaucoup d'ensemble; et le moment où agitant leurs chapeaux et leurs sabres ils crient tous à la fois, *Aux armes citoyens!* fait vraiment frisonner."

[49] Weber, *Mém.*, ch. v. p. 212.

[50] The Department of Paris comprised the forty-eight sections and sixteen rural districts.

[51] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 273.

Denmark, like other states, had recognised the new French constitution, and that no direct and public step had as yet been taken to overthrow it. The King of Denmark, it was added, had already preserved his subjects from the dangers of infection, by a measure adapted to the genius of the nation; a reply which must have sounded very like a reproof to the allied Governments.[52]

The Duke of Brunswick arrived at Coblenz, July 3rd, in the environs of which place the troops under his command were assembling. The emigrant princes now retired to Bingen. The Emperor and the King of Prussia had an interview at Mentz, July 19th. The Emperor only reserved to himself the direction of his army in the Netherlands, commanded by the Duke of Saxe Teschen. From this 15,000 men were to be detached to cover the right of the Prussian advance and join them near Longwy; while another Austrian army of 20,000 men under Prince Hohenlohe, was to be directed between the Rhine and Moselle to cover the Prussian left, menace Landau, and lay siege to Thionville. A third Austrian *corps d'armée*, under Prince Esterhazy, assembled in the Breisgau, and with 5000 emigrants under the Prince of Condé, menaced the French frontiers from Switzerland to Phillipsbourg. The French armies were inferior in number to those of the allies; that of Lafayette could hardly be relied on, and, to add to the danger, symptoms of insurrection had manifested themselves in La Vendée and other provinces. Yet when the decree that the country was in danger was proclaimed, July 22nd, in the principal places of Paris, amid the roll of drums and the booming of cannon, thousands rushed to enrol themselves as volunteers in the tents and booths erected for that purpose.

Amidst these hostile preparations the fate of both the King and monarchy was drawing to a crisis. The federal troops, instead of proceeding to Soissons after the fête; had remained at Paris; and on July 17th they sent a deputation to read to the Assembly an address drawn up by Robespierre, in which the suspension of the King's executive power, the impeachment of Lafayette, the discharge of military commanders nominated by the King, the dismissal and punishment of the departmental directors, &c., were imperiously demanded.[53] Meanwhile the Girondists, threatened on one side by the Court and Lafayette, and on the other by the more violent Jacobins, were endeavouring to work on the King's fears, and reduce him to the dilemma either of throwing himself into their hands, or being crushed by Robespierre and the repub-

[52] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 207 sqq.

[53] Louis Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. vi. p. 486.

lican party. Vergniaud, Guadet, and Gensonné found means to send a letter to Louis XVI. through his *valet de chambre*, Thierry, in which they told him that a terrible insurrection was preparing; that his abdication, or something still more dreadful, would be the result, and recommended, as a means to avert the catastrophe, that Roland, Servan, and Clavière should be immediately reinstated in the ministry. A threatening address to the King, got up in the secret conclaves of the Gironde, was also read in the Assembly, July 26th. It concluded thus: "You can still, Sire, save the country, and with it your crown; dare then to will it. Let the name of your ministers, let the sight of the men who surround you, appeal to the public confidence." But the address was greeted with tumultuous disapprobation by the people in the tribunes.[54]

Measures had now been taken to organise an insurrection. A central bureau of correspondence among the forty-eight sections had been established at the Hôtel de Ville, July 17th, at which commissaries from the various sections appeared every day; and thus a rapid communication was established among them all. These commissaries ultimately formed, on the day of the insurrection, the revolutionary *Commune*, which ejected the legitimate General Council of the Municipality.[55] Already some affairs had occurred which foreshadowed the coming event. The Marseillese had got up a quarrel with some grenadiers of the national guard, in which blood had been spilt. This affair increased the agitation among the respectable classes, and filled every bosom with hatred or fear. The national guards of the more aristocratic quarters of Paris were burning to put an end to the Revolution, and a band of courageous gentlemen had offered their services in defence of the palace.

The 20th of June had been the day of the *Gironde*; the 10th of August, for which, after some postponements, the second insurrection was ultimately fixed, was to achieve the triumph of the *Montagne*, or ultra-democrats. Most of the leading Girondists, Brissot, Vergniaud, Condorcet, Isnard, Lasource, and others, opposed the movement; Brissot and Isnard even talked of sending Robespierre before the Court at Orleans, which would have been equivalent to bringing him to the scaffold;[56] Pétion and Rœderer, though with fear and doubt, ultimately lent their aid to the insurrection. But the men who had incited it, and were to reap its

[54] Rœderer, *Chronique de 50 jours*, ap. Croker, *Essays on the French Revol.*, p. 212; L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.*, t. vii. p. 4.

[55] M. Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. ii. p. 138.

[56] L. Blanc, t. vii. p. 20.

fruits, kept themselves in the background. Neither Robespierre nor Danton, though each after his manner was urging on the movement, took part in the secret insurrectional committee at the Jacobins, which consisted for the most part of obscure persons. Danton, whose character, if more corrupt,[57] was at least more open than Robespierre's, made no secret of his hopes of profit and advantage from the event. The views of the sly and egotistical Robespierre were more designing and ambitious. He sounded Barbaroux on the subject of procuring for him a dictatorship by means of the Marseillese; but Barbaroux flatly refused.[58] Marat was afraid to abide the outbreak which his atrocious writings had so much contributed to produce; and feeling himself insecure in his cellar, he besought Barbaroux to conduct him to Marseilles in the disguise of a jockey.[59]

While Paris was thus on the eve of an insurrection, the bitter feeling which prevailed against the Court was increased tenfold by a highly injudicious manifesto published by the Duke of Brunswick, July 25th, on breaking up from Coblenz to invade the French frontier. In this paper it was declared: That the object of the Coalition was, to put an end to anarchy in France, and to restore Louis XVI. to his legitimate authority; that if the King was not immediately restored to perfect liberty, or if the respect and inviolability due to him and the royal family were infringed, the Assembly, the Department, the Municipality, and other public bodies would be made responsible with their heads; that if the palace was insulted or forced, and any violence offered to the King or his family, Paris would be abandoned to military execution and total destruction. But—what was felt as more insulting than all this—if the Parisians promptly obeyed these orders, then the allied princes engaged to obtain from Louis XVI. a pardon for their faults and errors. By a second declaration, dated July 27th, the Duke threatened that if the King or any member of the royal family should be carried off from Paris, the road through which they had been conducted should be marked by a continued series of exemplary punishments.[60]

[57] He had already touched 30,000 livres, the money of the Court. See *Corr. entre Mirabeau et le Comte de la Marck*, t. iii. p. 82; *Mémoires de Lafayette*, ap. L. Blanc, t. v. p. 378, t. vii. p. 27 and 96.

[58] *Mémoires* de Barbaroux, ch. v. p. 62 sqq. We see no reason for doubting this statement, with M. L. Blanc (t. vii. p. 30), merely because it agrees not with Robespierre's public speeches. Barbaroux charged Robespierre with the design to his face in the Convention, Sept. 25th 1792. Robespierre was silent; and though his creature Panis denied the charge, it was supported by Rebecqui. See *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 88 sqq.

[59] Barbaroux, *Ibid.*

[60] The manifest will be found in the *Hist. Parl.* t. xvi. and in L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, ch. viii. App.

The tone of this manifest was not at all in accordance with the suggestions of Mallet du Pan. It had been drawn up by the Marquis de Limon, according to the views of Calonne, and had obtained the approbation of the allied sovereigns, though the Duke of Brunswick himself disapproved of it. The passage respecting the destruction of Paris is even said to have been inserted after it had received the Duke's signature.[61] At all events, the manifest should not have been published till the allied armies were nearer to Paris, and after issuing it, the march of the troops on that capital should have been precipitated. We do not, however, believe that this manifesto caused the overthrow of the French monarchy; that was already determined on; but by wounding the national pride of the French, it strengthened the impending insurrection, and also roused them to a more vigorous defence against the invasion. A little after Monsieur, the King's brother, and other emigrant princes, published at Trèves (August 8th) a declaration of their motives and intentions. Their army, of about 12,000 men, was to keep in the rear of the Prussians, and follow their line of operations.[62] The accession of the Court of Turin to the Coalition, July 25th, which offered to furnish 40,000 men,[63] must also have tended to irritate the French.

The Duke of Brunswick's manifesto was officially communicated to the Assembly, August 3rd; when the King thought proper to assure the Chamber in a letter, that he would never compound the glory and interests of the nation, never receive the law at the hands of foreigners or a party; that he would maintain the national independence with his last breath, &c.[64] Such professions were, to say the least, very uncandid, when he was negociating with the enemies of France. On the same day, Pétion, at the head of a deputation from the *Commune*, appeared at the bar of the Assembly, denounced the *crimes* of Louis XVI., his sanguinary projects against Paris, demanded his abdication.[65] The petition which he presented to this purport had been approved by all the Sections of Paris except one. The insurrection would have taken place immediately, but Santerre, the leader of the Faubourg St. Antoine, and the devoted servant of Robespierre, was not yet prepared.

The King was informed almost hourly of the state of the preparations for the attack on the Tuileries. The anxiety that reigned in the palace may be easily conceived. Extensive means of defence

[61] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 427 sqq.; *Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. i. p. 316 sqq.

[62] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 434 sq.

[63] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 180.

[64] Ap. Smyth, vol. ii. p. 327.

[65] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvi. p. 315 sqq.

were adopted, and the King and Queen were not altogether without hopes that it might be successful. Royalty had not yet lost all its supporters. There was in the Assembly a large, but timid, party, the friends of order; and the accusation of Lafayette, proposed by Brissot, had been rejected by a majority of almost two to one. But the members who had voted the rejection were hissed and maltreated on leaving the House. The palace of the Tuileries was at that time much more defensible than it is at present. The Place du Carrousel was covered with small streets; the court of the palace was enclosed with a wall instead of a railing, and not open, as at present, but divided by ranges of small buildings. Mandat, whose turn it was to command the national guard, a man of courage and who had been an officer in the regular army, was a zealous constitutionalist, and several battalions of that force were also ardently attached to the throne. Mandat's arrangements were judicious. Twelve guns were planted round the palace, others on the Pont Neuf, to prevent the junction of the men of the Faubourg St. Marceau with those of the Faubourg St. Antoine; a force was stationed to observe the Hôtel de Ville, with instructions to let the mob pass from the Faubourg St. Antoine, and then to attack them in the rear. The most effective force, however, was the Swiss guard, about 950 men.

None of the leading Jacobins took any active part in the execution of the attack. Even Barbaroux and his friends Rebecqui and Pierre Baille excused themselves from leading their compatriots, the Marseillese, on the ground that they were the official representatives of the town of Marseilles.[66] On this eventful day, the destinies of France were left in the hands of the commissaries of the Sections, all of them obscure persons, though a few, as Billaud Varennes, Hébert, Bourdon de l'Oise, and two or three more, afterwards became noted in the annals of the Revolution. These men proceeded to the Hôtel de Ville on the night of August 9th, formed themselves into a new *Commune*, and expelled the existing legitimate Council; retaining of the previous magistrates only Pétion, Manuel, and Danton, and the sixteen administrators. One of the first acts of the insurrectionary *Commune* was to send for Mandat. On entering the Council Hall he was astonished to find it filled with new faces. Before he could recover from his surprise he was overwhelmed with questions. Why had he doubled the guard at the palace? Had he not detained the mayor there? Had he not told Pétion that he should answer with his head for any disturb-

[66] *Mém.* de Barbaroux, p. 66 sq.; Ternaux, t. ii. p. 307 note.

ance? Mandat replied as well as he could. He pleaded an order of the mayor for the arrangements he had made, which he appears really to have received, though he had it not about him. The president of the *Commune* required him to withdraw half the forces at the Tuileries, but Mandat refused to sign the order. Suddenly is handed in the order he had given to the battalion of the national guards at the Hôtel de Ville to attack the insurgents in the rear, which excites loud cries of indignation. The insurrectionary *Commune* now decide that Mandat shall be transferred to the prison of the Abbaye, *for his greater security*. The assassins at the command of the commissaries understand what this means. They drag Mandat from the place where he was temporarily confined and hurry him towards the staircase leading to the Place de Grève; but on the first steps he is shot through the head with a pistol bullet. The commissaries must have heard his groans and the shouts of his assassins; but they interrupted not their deliberations.[67] They now appointed Santerre to be provisional commandant-general of the national guard.

The *tocsin* had been sounding since midnight from all the steeples of Paris, but at first the affluence of the people was not very great. The inmates of the palace had passed a sleepless night. The Queen and Madame Elizabeth wandered about the apartments; the King spent a long time with his confessor, and then in vain sought a little repose upon a sofa. At five o'clock in the morning of August 10th, he visited the military posts; but his appearance was calculated to excite anything but courage and enthusiasm. He was dressed in a violet suit; his *chapeau de bras* being placed under his arm permitted the disorder of his hair to be seen; which, on one side, had become unpowdered, from lying on the sofa. His eyes were red from weeping and want of sleep, his unconnected phrases betrayed the trouble and agitation of his mind. At six o'clock he held a sort of review. Some of the national guards received him with cries of *Vive le Roi*! but the cannoniers and the battalion *Croix Rouge* shouted *Vive la Nation*! On crossing the garden to visit the posts at the Pont Tournant, he was saluted by the battalions of pikemen with yells of *à bas le Véto*! *à bas le traître*! These men took up a position near the Pont Royal, and turned their guns on the Tuileries; others did the like on the Place du Carrousel. Thus the palace was menaced by those summoned to defend it! Marie Antoinette could not help deploring the want of energy shown by the King, and remarked that the

[67] Mortimer Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. ii. p. 278.

review had done more harm than good.[68] Pétion, who was at the Tuileries on pretence of official duties, seemed ill at ease, and even in danger, among the crowd of royalist gentlemen; but he was summoned away by the new *Commune* and *consigned* to his hotel.[69]

The insurgent columns were now advancing in dense masses. The death of Mandat, the withdrawal of the cannon from the Pont Neuf, had spoilt the whole plan of defence. To Rœderer, *procureur-syndic* of the Department, and a Girondist, who was at the palace in his official capacity, must be mainly attributed the result of the day. It was he who, with treacherous counsels, and in order to throw the King into the hands of his faction, persuaded him to abandon the palace and take refuge in the Assembly. As early as four o'clock in the morning, before there was any pressing danger, he had suggested this course, but the Queen opposed it. Rœderer then pretended to superintend the defence and animate the troops; but the word ran from rank to rank, "we cannot fire on our brethren." The cannoniers especially would not listen to him. One of them extinguished his match, drew the charge of his gun, and threw it on the ground.[70] Rœderer now repeated his advice to the King to fly to the Assembly, and after a little hesitation Louis consented, to the great chagrin of the Queen. At seven in the morning he left his palace, never to return. It was with great difficulty the royal family made their way into the hall of the Assembly. The King was received tolerably well by the mob; but the Queen experienced gross insults and horrible threats, and was robbed of her purse and watch.

The royal family, on entering the Assembly, took their seats on the benches appropriated to the ministers. The King said: "I am come hither to avoid a great crime, and I think, gentlemen, that I can nowhere be safer than among you."—Vergniaud, the president, replied: "Sire, you may rely upon the firmness of the National Assembly; its members have sworn to die in support of the rights of the people and of the constituted authorities." A member having remarked that the constitution forbade them to debate in the King's presence, the royal family were conducted to a small box appropriated to the short-hand writers.

The departure of the King spread consternation through the

[68] Madame Campan, *Memoirs*, vol. ii. ch. x. (Engl. Transl.)

[69] Terneau, t. ii. p. 296.

[70] Several publications of the times charged Rœderer with suggesting this act of disaffection and mutiny, and he left the charge uncontradicted more than thirty years. See Croker, *Essays, &c.*, p. 228. It was also Rœderer who persuaded Mandat to go to the Town Hall. He published an account of the period between the 20th of June and 10th of August, called *Chronique de Cinquante jours.*

palace and was fatal to its defence. Who should fight in a self-abandoned cause? Whole battalions of the national guard either dispersed themselves or joined the men of the fauxbourgs. The Swiss alone showed admirable fidelity, courage, and discipline, though two, even of these, were induced to fraternise with the insurgents. They were brought down by shots from the gentlemen in the apartments of the palace. The first report of firearms caused a horrible confusion. Rage or terror filled every breast. The Swiss, ranged on the staircase of the palace, were ordered to fire, and in a moment scores of those who filled the vestibule were extended on the floor. Then, led by their colonel, Pfyffer, the Swiss made a sortie, cleared the Carrousel with much slaughter, seized three cannon and dragged them to the palace. But they had routed only the advanced guard of the insurrection. The bands of the fauxbourgs still came pouring on with horrible shouts for vengeance. At this crisis the defence was abandoned by order of the King, who sent to the Swiss, by M. d'Hervilly, an order to that effect, hastily written in pencil.[71] The greater part of this heroic band were killed in attempting a retreat, some towards the Assembly, some through the gardens of the Tuileries. Bonaparte, then in a state of poverty approaching destitution,[72] who beheld the attack on the palace from a shop on the Carrousel belonging to the brother of his friend and schoolfellow Bourrienne, observed, when at St. Helena, that after none of his battles had he been so struck with the aspect of death as by the heaps of corpses in the Tuileries garden.[73] The number killed on the side of the assailants appears, however, from recent researches, to have been under 200.[74]

[71] Mortimer Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. ii. p. 320 sqq. Most previous historians represent the palace as captured by the mob.

[72] He had formed with Bourrienne the project of making a living by taking houses and underletting them. Bourrienne, *Mém.*, t. i. p. 48.

[73] *Mém.* de Las Casas, t. v. p. 129.

[74] Terneau, *Ibid.* notes, p. 494.

CHAPTER IV.

The Girondists seemed at first to reap the fruits of a victory achieved by others. The Assembly, in which that party prevailed, assumed at once all the executive power of the State, and, at the instance of Vergniaud, its president, directed the provisional suspension of the King, the nomination of a governor for the prince royal, the installation of the King and royal family at the Luxembourg, sanctioned the decrees on which the King had placed his *veto*, ordered the accusation of the minister, Abancourt, for not carrying out a decree against the Swiss guard, sent commissaries to the armies to suspend the generals, decreed domiciliary visits to suspected persons.[1] All this was done, August 10th, in the presence of the King. The Assembly also took upon itself to form a new ministry; restored Roland, Servan, and Clavière to their former places, appointed Lebrun minister for Foreign Affairs, Monge to the Department of Marine, Danton to that of Justice. Danton, a sort of caricature of Mirabeau, but without his genius, had been an advocate in the King's Council since 1787, but had little practice. He was remarkable for his high stature, athletic form, stentorian voice, and what he called his audacity, which was rather effrontery. These endowments served to qualify him for a demagogue and bully; but he quailed if boldly met.[2] He had hidden himself during the insurrection; but after the victory he appeared at the head of the Marseillese with a great sabre, as if he had been the hero of the day.[3] He appointed Camille Desmoulins and Fabre d'Eglantine his secretaries.

But the reins of power were really held at this juncture by the new *Commune*, or Municipality. It was not till the morning of August 11th that the wary Robespierre had caused himself to be named a member of it for the Section in which he lived, that of the *Piques*, Place Vendôme.[4] But he avoided appearing prominently in it, kept himself in a corner of the Council Chamber, yet directed all the steps of the *Commune*; and while the Legislative

[1] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 18 sq.
[2] Prudhomme, t. ii. p. 326.
[3] Louvet, *Mémoires*, p. 13, ap. Gran. de Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 449 sq.
[4] He now lived with Duplay, the joiner, Rue St. Honoré.

Assembly existed, headed several violent deputations to its bar.[5] Marat was also a leading member of the insurrectionary *Commune*; such was their respect for him that they assigned him a private tribune.[6] Led by these demagogues, the Municipality assumed all the functions of Government; ordered, among other things, the barriers to be closed, passports to be suspended; the ladies of the Queen and several officers of the national guard to be interrogated; decreed a number of arrests, thus filling the prisons for the ensuing massacres. On August 12th, the Assembly surrendered the custody of the King and his family to the *Commune*, and on the following day Pétion conducted them to the Temple. Here the King was lodged in a gloomy apartment lighted by a single window, and furnished with a wretched bed and a few chairs. The royal family were not even provided with necessary clothes. The Countess of Sutherland, lady of the English ambassador, sent some of her son's for the Dauphin. The Tuileries had been abandoned to be plundered by the mob.

The Legislative Assembly was itself to be dissolved, to make room for a National Convention. Robespierre had proposed this step at the Jacobin Club, on the evening of August 10th.[7] On the 11th, the Assembly decreed its own abdication, and fixed the mode of electing a Convention. The electoral franchise was now extended; the distinction of *active* and *inactive* citizens was suppressed; every Frenchman, aged twenty-five, living by his own labour or income, and not in domestic service, if he had taken the civic oath, was declared an elector.[8] But the double degree of election was retained; that is, primary assemblies to choose electoral assemblies, which last returned the deputies. The former were to meet on Sunday, August 26th; the latter on Sunday, September 2nd.

A mixed commission, composed of members of the Assembly and of the *Commune*, appointed to search the Tuileries, found some letters and documents, which proved that the King had compromised himself with the counter-Revolution.[9] The *Commune* compelled the Assembly to appoint an extraordinary criminal tribunal. Robespierre refused the presidency of the new tribunal. He had also resigned, in April 1792, the office of Public Accuser, which he had exercised since the preceding February. On the

[5] Mortimer Terneau, t. iii. liv. ix.
[6] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 196.
[7] *Ibid.* p. 178.
[8] The Constituent Assembly had decreed that a contribution of three days' labour was a necessary qualification to vote in the primary assemblies. *Hist. Parl.* t. iii.
[9] *Rapport* de Gohier, *Hist. Parl.*, t. xvii. p. 82.

establishment of the extraordinary criminal tribunal, August 18th, the *Commune* directed the new instrument of execution, called the *guillotine*, to be permanently erected in the Place du Carrousel, but the knife to be removed every night.[10] The first victims of this tribunal were Delaporte, *intendant* of the civil list, D'Angremont, the Queen's master of languages, one Solomon, convicted of forgery, and the journalist Durozoy. Thus was inaugurated the reign of blood; Robespierre had invoked it in the last number of his *Défenseur*.[11] The dominion of the ochlocracy had commenced, of the men who were to strangle the Revolution by their excesses, and prepare the way for a military despotism. Its advent was signalised by some acts of senseless brutality. By order of the *Commune*, the statues of Henry IV., of Louis XIV., and Louis XV., and other monuments, were overthrown; they even decreed the destruction of all emblems and monuments of feudality and despotism in private houses.[12] It was also decreed that the title of *Citoyen* should be substituted for that of *Monsieur*; and that in public acts after *l'an IV. de la liberté* should be added, *l'an I. de l'égalité*. But, though Paris seemed unanimous, the Revolution of August 10th was not universally welcomed in France. Symptoms of dissatisfaction were manifested at Metz, Nanci, Rouen, Amiens, Strasbourg, and other places.[13]

The Assembly had decreed the accusation of Barnave, Alexander Lameth, Montmorin, Bertrand de Moleville, and others; and on August 18th it fulminated against General Lafayette, who had caused the three commissaries sent to suspend him to be arrested at Sedan. Paris was filled with alarm at the idea of an attack from his army; the Assembly decreed that the King and royal family, the wives and children of the emigrants, should be held as hostages against it. But Lafayette's troops held not the principles of their chief. They replied to his addresses with cries of *Vive la nation! vive l'Assemblée Nationale! vivent la liberté et l'égalité.* On the night of August 19th, Lafayette fled with a few companions, hoping to reach the Dutch frontier; but he was arrested

[10] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 211. This instrument derived its name from Dr. Guillotin, a physician of Paris, and member of the Constituent Assembly, who first proposed it in Oct. 1789. His suggestion, however, was not attended to, and it was not till March 1792, that, by the advice of M. Louis, secretary to the College of Surgeons, it was first adopted by the Legislative Assembly. The first guillotine was designed and manufactured by one Schmidt, a piano-forte maker, of Strasbourg. See Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 182; Croker, *Essay* viii.

[11] Croker, *Essays*, p. 343.

[12] Duval, *Souvenirs de la Terreur*, t. ii. p. 176 sq.; *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 119. It was a singular coincidence that the statue of Louis XIV., erected August 12th 1692, was overthrown August 12th 1792.

[13] Terneau, t. iii. p. 44.

by the Austrian outposts, transferred for some unknown reason to Prussian custody, and successively imprisoned at Wesel, Neiss, and Glatz.[14] Dumouriez was now appointed Commander-in-Chief of the two armies that covered the frontiers, and Luckner was superseded by Kellermann.

The allies were now advancing. The Prussian light troops had entered the French territory, August 12th. Some of the inhabitants of Sierck having fired upon them from their windows, that place was abandoned to military execution; a *début* which produced a bad impression.[15] The main body of the Prussian army, which had taken three weeks to accomplish forty leagues, crossed the frontier, August 18th, and encamped at Tiercelet, where it formed a junction with the Austrians under Clairfait. The plan of the invasion is said to have been furnished by M. de Bouillé.[16] Longwy, invested by the Duke of Brunswick and General Clairfait, August 20th, capitulated on the 24th. This event was seized upon by the Jacobin leaders, who artfully fomented the excitement it naturally produced. The Assembly decreed that every citizen, in a besieged place, who talked of surrender should be put to death; that Longwy should be razed; that a new levy of 30,000 men should be made.[17] On August 27th was given a grand funeral fête, in honour of those who had fallen on the 10th; the passions of the people were roused by a long procession of their widows and orphans. Next day Danton declared in the Assembly that the despots could be made to retreat only by "a great national convulsion," insisted on the necessity of seizing all traitors; demanded authority to make domiciliary visits, for the purpose, as he said, of seizing the arms of suspected persons.[18] These visits were made, by order of the *Commune*, on the night of August 29th, when several thousand persons were arrested, but the greater part were released on the following day. The Assembly at last made an endeavour to stem the insolent assumption of authority by the *Commune*, and decreed, August 30th, the election of a new Municipality; but Pétion appeared at the bar at the head of a deputation on the 31st, and frightened the Chamber into an abandonment of the measure.

[14] Terneau, t. iii. p. 72 sq. At the Peace of Basle, 1795, the Prussians handed him over to Austria. He was now confined at Olmütz, and was at length released by Bonaparte at the Peace of Campo Formio, after a harsh confinement of four years.

[15] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 436.

[16] *Ibid.* p. 372.

[17] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 126. It was in the midst of these alarms that several distinguished foreigners were admitted to French citizenship, as Priestley, Payne, Bentham, Wilberforce, Clarkson, Mackintosh, D. Williams, Gerani, Anacharsis Clootz, Compre, Cornelius Paw, Pestalozzi, Washington, Hamilton, Maddison, Klopstock, Gilleers, Kosciusko. *Fastes de la Révol.* ap. Blanc, t. vii p. 117.

[18] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 214.

On this occasion, Tallien, who read the address, uttered this ominous sentence, *inserted with Robespierre's own hand*:[19] "We have caused the refractory priests to be arrested; they are confined in a private house; and in a few days the soil of liberty will be purged of their presence!"[20]

On Sunday morning, September 2nd, news arrived at Paris that Verdun had been invested; that the Duke of Brunswick, in summoning it, had declared that places which did not surrender would be abandoned to the fury of the soldiery.[21] The *Commune* now directed the barriers to be closed, horses to be seized to convey troops to the frontiers; citizens to hold themselves in readiness to march at the first signal. Alarm-guns were fired, the *tocsin* was rung, the *générale* beaten. These measures had the intended effect. "Let us fly to meet the enemy!" cried the people. But another portion, better instructed, shouted: "Let us hasten to the prisons,"—which had just been filled—"shall we leave these traitors behind us, to murder our wives and children if we perish?" A rational fear of a few thousand unarmed prisoners!

Such was the beginning of the horrible MASSACRES OF SEPTEMBER. The first victims were some priests, who were being conveyed in carriages to the prison of the Abbaye, about half-past two in the afternoon; several of whom were murdered before they reached the Abbaye. When the carriages entered the court of the prison it was found to be filled with a multitude of people, who must have been admitted by the authorities. The massacre at this place lasted till five o'clock, when a voice exclaimed, "There is nothing more to be done here—let us go to the Carmelites." This prison contained 186 ecclesiastics and three laymen. The priests were asked whether they would take the civic oath? and on their heroically refusing, they were conducted to the garden of the convent, and despatched with muskets and swords. Only fourteen contrived to escape over the walls.

About six in the evening an officer of the national guard informed the General Council of the Municipality of what was passing. This body could doubtless have arrested the massacres, had they been so inclined, by ordering out the national guard; but they contented themselves with sending commissaries to the different prisons to protect persons incarcerated for debt; thus showing that they had the power to save the rest, had they been so disposed, and, therefore, virtually sanctioning their murder. They went through

[19] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. p. 175 note.

[20] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. pp. 163—167.

[21] *Ibid.* p. 336.

the farce of sending a message to the Assembly to deliberate respecting the crowds assembled at the prisons.[22] But the Assembly was frightened and powerless. All it did was to send some commissaries to the Abbaye, who, after some vain attempts to be heard, retired. The prisoners were subjected to a sort of burlesque trial. Maillard, the grim hero of the Bastille and of October 5th, acted the part of judge; ten armed men, seated at a table, formed an extempore jury. Similar scenes passed at the other prisons during five consecutive days. The verdict "Liberate the gentleman" was the signal to kill the unhappy wretch who thought he had escaped. Some who boldly avowed that they were royalists were spared; any equivocation or falsehood was attended with certain death. A young lady, Mdlle. Sombreuil, saved her father by consenting to drink a glass of wine mixed with human blood.[23] Among the victims were the minister Montmorin, and the beautiful Princess de Lamballe, one of the Queen's favourites, who was murdered because she refused the oath of hatred of royalty. Her body was subjected to the most obscene brutalities; her head was cut off, stuck on a pike, and paraded before the Temple, when a municipal officer insisted that the Queen should go to the window. She fainted at the sight. When the murderers had cleared the chief prisons, they went to the Bicêtre and La Salpêtrière, and massacred women and children, paupers and lunatics. The total number of victims at Paris is reckoned at between 1400 and 1500,[24] to whom must be added the prisoners detained at Orleans, fifty-three in number. Alquier, president of the department Seine et Oise, rode post-haste to Paris to intreat Danton to spare them; he was told by the "Minister of Justice!" to mind his own business. When these prisoners arrived at Marseilles, they were all massacred, September 9th. Among them were the ex-minister De Lessart and the Duke de Brissac, formerly commander of the King's guard. The ruffian Fournier, called the American, but who was in reality a native of Auvergne, leader of the band which committed this massacre, had a regular commission from Roland, minister of the Interior.[25]

The Committee of Surveillance addressed a circular to the different departments, September 3rd, calling upon them to follow the bloody example set by the capital, as a necessary means of

[22] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 350.

[23] See Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. p. 288 note.

[24] Prudhomme, *Hist. gen. et impart.*, ap. Gr. de Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 240 sq.; L. Blanc, t. vii. p. 196. M. Terneau (t. iii. p. 548) estimates them at 1368.

[25] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. p. 368. For details of the massacres, see the *Relation* of the Abbé Sicard and Jourgniac St. Méard, *Mon agonie de 38 heures*, in Barrière's *Biblioth. des Mém.*, t. xviii.

public safety. This circular, which bears among other signatures that of Marat, was forwarded with the counter-sign of Danton. It is not so generally known that Danton added a circular of his own, exhorting the inhabitants of the provincial towns to fly to arms and leave nobody behind who might trouble them during the march against the enemy.[26] The exhortations produced, however, but little effect. At Reims about eight persons were murdered, eleven at Lyon, fourteen at Meaux. At the last place the assassins are said to have come from Paris.[27]

There can be no doubt that the September massacres were premeditated, though a few ultra-revolutionary writers, including M. Louis Blanc, have maintained the contrary. They appear to have been determined on at latest by August 26th, and probably one of the chief objects of them was to influence the elections for the Convention.[28] It can be proved that the ministry knew of them beforehand; that the *concierges* and other authorities at the prisons were prepared for what was to happen; that the assassins, consisting chiefly of Marseillese and Federal soldiers, were quietly admitted into the prisons; that great part of them were hired and paid for their bloody work;[29] that records of the sections still existing, as those of the sections Luxembourg and Poisonnière, show that the massacres were deliberately voted; and that the same thing was done in other places may be inferred from the circumstance that in the registers of several sections the leaves containing the transactions of September 2nd and 3rd are torn out.[30] A further proof of foreknowledge and design is, that many prisoners were liberated by the leaders of the *Commune* before the massacres began, either from private friendship, or for the sake of money. The Prince de Poix and Beaumarchais bought their lives of Panis and

[26] From the archives of Angers, ap. Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 548.

[27] *Hist. Parl.* t. xvii. p. 433 sqq.; Toulongeon, t. ii. p. 292.

[28] Von Sybel, *Ibid.*, S. 522.

[29] M. L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. vii. p. 206, denies this fact; asserts that no traces can be found in the accounts of the *Commune* of wages paid to the executioners, and contends that any entries of money paid to workmen at this time relate only to the burial of the bodies. But though he has diligently used the *Hist. Parlementaire*, he seems to have overlooked the following passage: "Mandat du 4 Sept., signé N—, Je—, La —, commissaires de la Commune, visé Me—: au profit de Gil—Pet—, pour prix du temps qu'ils ont mis, lui et trois de ses camarades à l'expédition des prêtres de St. Firmin pendant 2 jours, suivant la réquisition qui est faite aux dits commissaires par la section des Sans Culottes, qui les a mis en ouvrage, ci . . . 48 liv." *H. P.* t. xviii. p. 231. The word *expédition*, we presume, can hardly mean *burial*. See further respecting payment of the murderers, Gr. de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 240; Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. note xviii. This last note may be considered as decisive of the question of organisation.

[30] The proceedings of all the Sections will be found in Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. note xiii. See also Sorel, *Le Couvent des Carmes*, ch. ix.; Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. iv. p. 132.

Manuel.[31] It proves nothing against the general fact of premeditation, that among the assassins were some who may be called amateurs. It is said that among the murderers at the Abbaye were persons established as apparently respectable tradesmen in the neighbourhood, and that the assassins of the priests at the Carmes were well-dressed men armed with fowling-pieces, and belonging evidently to the wealthier class.[32] It is nothing surprising that a city which could produce the murderers of Foulon, Berthier, Delaunay, which found educated men to approve them, which devoured, with avidity, the blood-thirsty ravings of Marat, should contain men willing to imbrue their hands *gratis* in the blood of the priests.

The chief instigators of the massacres were Danton, Marat, and the Committee of Surveillance; one of the principal agents of them was Billaud Varennes. At the prison of La Force, members of the Municipality, in their scarves of office, were seen to preside over and legalise the butchery.[33] Robespierre's share in these atrocities, if more obscure, is hardly less certain. He was too wary to take any prominent part. But that he had a foreknowledge of the massacres appears from the fact, that he, as well as Tallien and others, reclaimed from the prisons some priests who had been their tutors.[34] Panis, one of the most active of the Committee of Surveillance, was Robespierre's creature, acting only by his command. Robespierre afterwards endeavoured to exculpate himself by some glaring falsehoods. He affirmed that he had ceased to go to the *Commune* before the massacres occurred; yet the minutes record his presence September 1st and 2nd.[35] Pétion also declared that he saw Robespierre at the Hôtel de Ville *during the massacres*, and reproached him with the part he had taken in the denunciations and arrests.[36]

The Girondists are not exempt from blame, though their part in the massacres was that of cowardly connivance. We have mentioned Roland's agency in the matter of the Orleans prisoners. The journals published under the patronage of the Minister of the Interior represented the massacres as necessary and just.[37] Pétion, when applied to by men bespattered with blood for orders respecting eighty prisoners at La Force, exclaimed, "Do for the best!" and offered the assassins some wine.[38] Brissot was publicly charged

[31] Prudhomme, ap. Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 530.
[32] Blanc, t. vii. p. 154, 214.
[33] Michelet, t. iv. p. 175.
[34] *Ibid.* p. 121.
[35] *Ibid.* p. 124.
[36] Prudhomme, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 240. M. Blanc omits this anecdote.
[37] Blanc, t. vii. p. 186 sq.
[38] Evidence of Chabot in the trial of the Girondists, confirmed by Fabre d'Eglantine. *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. pp. 49, 71, 88, 106.

by Chabot with having informed him, on the morning of September 2nd, of the plot to massacre the prisoners.[39]

The massacres were attended and followed in Paris by the greatest disorders. The populace broke into the royal cellars in the Carrousel, and, in their new capacity of sovereign, appropriated the contents. Watches and trinkets were demanded in the streets as offerings to the country. The *Garde-Meuble* was broken open and many of the crown diamonds stolen, among them the celebrated *Regent*. Sargent, Panis, Deforgues, and other members of the Municipal Committee, divided the spoils of the murdered.[40]

From these revolting scenes we turn with pleasure to view the French character on a brighter side. With patriotic enthusiasm volunteers enrolled themselves in great numbers; during a fortnight 1800 men left Paris daily for the frontier.[41] The Marseillese, however, the perpetrators of the massacres, who had been maintained at the expense of the *Commune*, refused to march.[42] Patriotic gifts poured in; even the market women brought 4000 francs. Verdun had surrendered, September 2nd, after a bombardment of fifteen hours; but the suicide of Beaurepaire, the commandant, who had opposed the capitulation, might apprise the Prussians of the resistance they were likely to meet. Dumouriez, who had only 25,000 men to oppose to the much superior forces of the Duke of Brunswick, had determined to occupy the forest of Argonne, a branch of the Ardennes, which separates the Trois Evêchés from Champagne Pouilleuse, and to make it the Thermopylæ of France.[43] But being driven from two of the passes he had occupied, and a superior force of the allies threatening to turn his flank, he retreated in the night of September 14th to St. Menehould. Here he was joined by Kellermann and Bourponville with their divisions, which brought up his army to more than 50,000 men. The Prussians attacked Kellermann at Valmy, September 20th, but the Duke of Brunswick withdrew the columns that had been formed, and were actually marching to storm the heights, to the great chagrin of the King of Prussia, who was present, and who had ordered the advance.[44] The Duke de Chartres, eldest son of the Duke of Orléans, and his brother, the Duke de Montpensier, were present at this battle, which was little more than a cannonade. It had, however, important consequences. The Prussians, deceived by the representations of the French émigrants, that their

[39] *Hist. Parl.* t. xx. p. 444.

[40] *Archives de la Seine*, ap. Michelet, *Révol.*, t. v. p. 117 note, cf. *Idem.* t. iv. p. 223.

[41] *Hist. Parl.* t. xviii. p. 333.

[42] Terneau, t. iii. p. 126.

[43] For this campaign see the *Mémoires* of Dumouriez, t. iii.

[44] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 479.

advance would be a mere military promenade, had not provided themselves with magazines; the peasants had laid waste the surrounding country, bad weather set in, the roads became almost impracticable, the men were suffering severely from dysentery. It is said, too, that the Duke of Brunswick, dazzled with the offer of being placed at the head of the French Revolution, and influenced also, probably, by the political views explained in the preceding chapter, did not push the war with much ardour.[45] Instead of advancing on Châlons, as the King of Prussia, the Russian, Austrian, and emigrant parties desired, the Duke renewed negociations with Dumouriez; offered much milder conditions than those previously threatened; said nothing about restoring the ancient *régime*; demanded only the release of the King, and the cessation of all propagandism. But the Convention had now assembled; the executive council refused to listen to any terms till the French territory had been evacuated; and Dumouriez, in reply to the Duke's proposals, handed to the Prussian envoy the decree establishing a Republic! There was now nothing left to the Prussians but to retreat, and Dumouriez, authorised by Danton, agreed not to molest them. They crossed the Rhine at Coblenz towards the end of October, and Dumouriez returned to Paris to enjoy his success.[46]

The NATIONAL CONVENTION had assembled September 21st. The Girondists, or Brissotins, who had sat on the left, or opposition, benches in the Legislative, formed the right of the Convention. In appearance they had the superiority. They occupied the ministry, they had a majority in the Assembly, and were supported by the moderate party. But they had placed themselves in a false position. They had gone too far for the Constitutionalists, and not far enough for the ultra-democrats and Jacobins. Opposite to them in terrible array was the faction of the MOUNTAIN, so called from the members of it occupying the highest benches on the left. The nucleus of this faction was formed by the twenty-four Parisian deputies and some determined republicans from the departments. The election of deputies had commenced at Paris September 2nd, and there can be no doubt that the massacres, if not actually designed for the purpose, as some writers have probably supposed, had a vast influence on the returns.[47] The list, headed by Robespierre and closed by the Duke of Orléans, now called Philippe

[45] *Homme d'état*, t. i. pp. 351, 481, &c.

[46] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 179 sq.; *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 496 sq.

[47] Terneau, *La Terreur*, t. iii. p. 192; Croker, *Essays, &c.*, p. 346; Michelet, t. iv. pp. 206, 217.

Égalité,[48] contains, among other names notorious in the annals of the Revolution, those of Danton, Collot d'Herbois, Manuel, Billaud Varennes, Camille Desmoulins, Marat, Legendre the butcher, Panis, Sergent, Fréron, Fabre d'Eglantine, Robespierre's brother Augustine, David the painter, &c. The Duke of Orléans, by accepting a seat in the Convention, identified himself with the mortal enemies of the King, his relative. Towards the end of 1791 a reconciliation had been attempted through Bertrand de Moleville. The King received the Duke and appeared entirely satisfied. But when the latter attended the levée on the following Sunday, the courtiers pressed round him, trod on his toes, and drove him to the door. Other insults followed so marked and numerous that he was compelled to retire. On descending the stairs he was spit upon. From this moment he abandoned himself to an implacable hatred, and vowed to revenge himself on the King and Queen.[49] The strength of the Mountain lay, not in their number, but in their being supported by the Jacobin Club, the *Commune*, and consequently the Parisian populace, then the supreme power in the state. They had succeeded in driving the Jacobins from the club, and had filled their places with *Sans-culottes*. Between the Gironde and the Mountain, voting sometimes with one, sometimes with the other, was seated the *Plain*, or the *Marsh*, consisting principally of new members without settled political connections. Their principles generally inclined them to the *Right*, but terror often compelled them to vote with the *Left*.[50]

The Convention, on the very first day it assembled, although only 371 members were present out of 749, decreed, on the motion of the Abbé Grégoire, the abolition of royalty.[51] This event had been prepared in the Legislative Assembly. At the instance of Chabot, September 4th, all the members had cried, "No King!" and taken an oath of eternal hatred to royalty.[52] On September 22nd, the Republic was proclaimed under the windows of the Temple. Louis XVI. heard, it is said, the sentence of deposition

[48] The origin of this name is thus explained: all persons absent from France having been placed on the list of *émigrés*, and the Duke of Orléans' daughter, with her governess, Madame de Genlis, being in England for purposes of education, the Duke went to the Hôtel de Ville, to solicit the striking out of their names. Manuel said, that no petition in the name of Bourbon could be received, and pointing to the statue of *Égalité*, invited the Duke to take it for his god-mother, which he did to save his child. *Revue Rétrosp.* 2 Sér. No. viii. ap. Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 395.

[49] Bertrand de Moleville, *Mém.*, t. i. p. 278 sq.

[50] Thos. Payne had been returned for the Pas de Calais, Dr. Priestley for the Department of the Orne, and Anacharsis Cloötz for that of the Oise. Priestley declined to serve because he did not speak French.

[51] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 18.

[52] *Ibid.* t. xvii. p. 437.

without emotion, and continued to read a book on which he was engaged. It was now ordered that the date of *fourth year of liberty* should be altered to *first of the Republic.*

A struggle for power between the Girondists and Mountaineers was inevitable. The Girondists charged their adversaries with promoting social anarchy in order to establish a dictatorship; while the Mountaineers denounced the Girondists as aiming to divide France into several federated republics, as those of Bordeaux, Marseilles, the Calvados, &c., after the manner of the United States of America; nay, they even imputed to them a design to restore royalty by means of a civil war. These were the war-cries of the two parties. Danton made some attempt to conciliate them, but without success. It was the Girondists who began the attack. Brissot preluded it by an article in his Journal, September 23rd;[53] and Kersaint followed it up next day by a speech in the Convention. The massacres were made the chief topic of offence. "It is time," exclaimed Kersaint, "to erect scaffolds for assassins, and for those who promote assassination;" adding, "Perhaps it requires some courage to speak of assassins in this place."[54] Barbaroux was put forward to make a desultory and unformal attack upon Robespierre, which led to nothing. The debate is chiefly remarkable for the first appearance in public of Marat. The Convention was not composed of very scrupulous persons; yet when Marat mounted the tribune he was greeted with universal shouts of astonishment and horror. "I have a great many personal enemies here," he coolly remarked. "All, all!" exclaimed the deputies, rising simultaneously. Nothing daunted, Marat went on to defend Robespierre. In the course of his speech he avowed having incited the people to the massacres, and concluded it with denouncing the Assembly as useless.[55] Cries now arose on all sides, "To the Abbaye! to the Abbaye!" But Marat outbraved these and other attempts to put him down. He had an inexhaustible fund of self-love and self-conceit. In a debate on October 4th, he declared his contempt for the decrees of the Assembly, and replied to the bursts of laughter which this excited by exclaiming, "No! you cannot hinder the man of genius from throwing himself into the future—you cannot appreciate the man of education who knows the world and anticipates events."[56] He despised the people, whose friend he called himself, and to whose blood-thirsty passions he pandered.[57] His cynicism, his filthy

[53] *Patriote Français*, No. 1140.
[54] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 59.
[55] *Ibid.* p. 97 sq.
[56] *Ibid.* p. 97 sq.
[57] Thus, for instance, he exclaims in his Journal: "Eternal asses (*badauds*), with

exterior and affectation of austere poverty, were but masks. He was not half so dirty at home as abroad. His cadaverous complexion, his greenish eyes, his greasy locks, bound up in a Madras handkerchief, his well-worn apparel, made his person squalid and disgusting; but his rooms were adorned with silk draperies, flowers, gilding, luxurious ottomans.[58]

On October 8th Buzot proposed to the Convention the project for a departmental guard of 4470 men. The scheme was violently denounced at the Jacobins and in Robespierre's Journal. "The two preceding Assemblies had not needed any guard; now, when a Republic was established, the Convention could exist only by the means which support tyranny! Was not the Assembly guarded by Frenchmen? What were the Parisians but a portion of the French people?" But the strongest arguments against the measure were the threatening deputations from the Sections, and especially from the Faubourg St. Antoine. The Girondists were compelled to abandon their guard; but the arrival of a third band of Marseillese, under the auspices of Barbaroux, encouraged them to proceed in their attacks upon the Mountain. On October 29th, Louvet, the author of the licentious novel of *Faublas*, made a formal but rambling accusation of Robespierre,[59] when Barère assisted his escape by an insult. "If," he said, "there was in the Assembly a man like Cæsar, Cromwell, or Sylla, he would accuse him, for such men were dangerous to liberty; but the little dabblers in revolutions, politicians of the hour, who would never enter the domain of history, were not worthy to occupy the valuable time of the Assembly." He then moved that they should pass to the order of the day: which was accordingly done.[60]

After Dumouriez's return to Paris, the Austrians, under Duke Albert of Saxe Teschen, had bombarded Lille (September 29th–October 8th) but without effect, and finding themselves abandoned by their allies, they retired to a fortified position at Jemappes, near Mons. Here they were attacked and defeated by Dumouriez, who had again placed himself at the head of the army (November 6th). The Duke de Chartres was also present in this action. After the retreat of the Prussians, the French general Custine had pushed on with his division to Spires, which he took by a *coup de main*. Learning here that the French would be welcomed as deliverers in the Rhenish provinces, he sent a detachment of 4500 men to

what epithets would I not overwhelm you, if I knew any more humiliating than that *of Parisians!*" *L'Ami du Peuple*, No. 402, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 419.

[58] Madame Roland, *Mémoires*, t. ii. p. 227 (ed. Berville et Barrière, 1827).

[59] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 422 sqq.

[60] *Ibid.* t. xx. p. 221 sq.

Worms, who were received with open arms; and he published a proclamation containing the democratic maxim then in vogue: "War to the palace, peace to the cottage." [61] Custine appeared before Mentz, October 19th, which place surrendered on the 21st. Here he opened a club on the model of the Jacobins, and was joined by many ecclesiastics, eager to break their vows; while the peasants also manifested a disposition to rise. Another French corps had occupied Frankfort without resistance, October 22nd. These successes, however, were not unmixed with reverses. Beurnonville, repulsed in an attempt upon Trèves at an advanced season of the year, retired into Lorraine. Custine, instead of seizing Coblenz, whence the Elector of Mentz had fled with his court after the capture of his capital, remained inactive, bribed, it is said, by the Prussians; he also neglected the defence of Frankfort, which the King of Prussia re-entered, December 2nd.

The Savoyards had also welcomed the French with open arms. War had been declared against the King of Sardinia, September 10th; a French army under General Montesquiou soon after entered Savoy, and occupied Chambéry, September 23rd. On the 29th, a French division under General Anselme entered Nice; and Villa Franca opened its gates on the first summons.[62]

The victory of Jemappes had opened Belgium to the French. Mons, Brussels, Liége, Namur, Antwerp, and other places, fell successively into their hands; and by the middle of December the conquest of the Austrian Netherlands was completed. In addition to these successes, a French fleet had appeared in November before Naples, and had compelled the Bourbon King to recognise the French Republic—the first acknowledgment of it by a foreign Power.

After the conquest of Belgium, the Jacobins sent agents thither to propagate their revolutionary doctrines. But the Flemings, who had at first received the French with enthusiasm, soon discovered that their yoke was heavier than that of their former masters; were disgusted by the requisitions made upon them, and a system of general pillage. Dumouriez, who disapproved these things, and had a scheme for the conquest of Holland, to which the Girondists were opposed, now came to Paris to remonstrate. He wished also to baffle the Jacobins and rescue the King from their hands.

On December 3rd the Convention had decreed that Louis XVI. should be brought to trial before them. A committee of twenty-

[61] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 46. See this work for the whole campaign, t. i. pp. 433—519, t. ii. pp. 1—99.

[62] *Hist. Parl.* t. xix. p. 189 sq.

four had been named to examine the papers found at the Tuileries, and had delivered a report conceived in a spirit of the most virulent hostility towards the King.[63] His death had been demanded by deputations of the sections, and addresses from the affiliated Jacobin Clubs, had been represented in puppet shows in the public streets and squares. In a debate on November 13th, whether the King could be brought to trial, the fanatical St. Just contended that the King could not be judged as a citizen, but as an enemy; that he was not included in the national contract, could not, therefore, be tried by the civil law, but by the law of nations. He denounced the inoffensive Louis as another Catiline, complained that the eighteenth century was less advanced than the age of Cæsar; then the tyrant was immolated in the Senate with no other formalities than twenty-two dagger thrusts, with regard to no other laws than the liberty of Rome.[64] Robespierre adopted the arguments of his friend St. Just. The Convention were not judges but a deliberative assembly; they were not there to try Louis, but to determine a question of public safety. Louis is King, the Republic is founded; either then Louis is already condemned, or the Republic is not acquitted. You invoke the Constitution in his favour; but the Constitution forbids what you have already done; go, fling yourselves at his feet and implore his mercy![65]

While Louis was thus savagely denounced, he and his family were leading a most exemplary life at the Temple. The King rose at six o'clock and devoted himself to religious exercises. At nine the family assembled for breakfast, after which Louis instructed his son in Latin and geography; Marie Antoinette gave lessons to her daughter; while Madame Elizabeth read books of devotion or employed herself with needlework. At one, the family again met for dinner; after which the children played together, while the King and Queen played a game of chess or piquet, or took a walk in the wretched garden, but under the inspection of two municipal officers. Nine was the hour for bedtime, when Louis, having given his blessing to his family, concluded the day, as he had begun it, with exercises of devotion. But they were not suffered to enjoy even this quiet life without molestation. Pétion appointed as their warder the ferocious vagabond who had threatened the King's life on June 20th. This fellow took a pleasure in annoying the royal prisoners; sometimes he would sing the *Carmagnole* before them,

[63] *Hist. Parl.* t. xx. p. 239 sqq. It charged Louis, among other things, with being an *accapareur*, or forestaller of sugar, wheat, and coffee.

[64] *Ibid.* p. 330.

[65] *Idem*, t. xxi. p. 162 sqq.

sometimes, knowing that the Queen disliked tobacco, he would puff some in her face. Manuel, with a malicious pleasure, related to the King the victories of the Republic, and ordered all his decorations and orders to be removed.[66]

On December 10th, the act of accusation on which the King was to be tried was read to the Convention. The principal charges alleged against him were: his having suspended the sittings of the National Assembly, June 20th, and subsequently attempted to dictate to and overawe it; having collected troops to support despotism by force; having caused many persons to be killed at the siege of the Bastille, and having ordered the governor to hold out to the last extremity; having summoned the regiment of Flanders to Versailles, followed by the *fête* of the *gardes du corps*, &c.; having sanctioned Bouillé's massacre at Nanci; having corrupted Mirabeau and others; the flight to Varennes and manifest drawn up on that occasion; having caused the people to be fired on in the Champ de Mars; having kept secret the Convention of Pilnitz, of which he was the head; having paid large sums of money to the emigrants; having purposely neglected the army, thus causing the fall of Longwi and Verdun; having neglected the navy; having provoked the insurrection of August 10th in order to massacre the people, &c. But this last charge was felt to be so shameless that it was subsequently withdrawn.[67]

On the following day Louis was brought before the Convention to be interrogated on these charges. Some he justified, some he denied; of some he declared that he had no knowledge, of others he threw the responsibility on his ministers. Nor must it be concealed that his denials were sometimes not only in the face of facts but even of his own handwriting. He disclaimed all knowledge of an iron safe found in the walls of the Tuileries, and of the papers it contained. Some of these revealed Mirabeau's venality; in consequence of which his bust at the Jacobins was overthrown, and that in the Convention veiled till his guilt should be more fully proved.

Louis was allowed counsel for his defence; and he selected Target and Tronchet for that purpose. Target having refused to act, Lamoignon de Malesherbes volunteered to supply his place. When that venerable old man appeared at the Temple, Louis embraced him and exclaimed: "Your sacrifice is the more generous, as you will expose your own life without being able to

[66] *Journal* de Cléry (containing the *Recit des évènemints arrivés au temple*, by the King's daughter); *Hist. abrégée de la Révol. et des malheurs qu'elle a occasionnés*, t. ii. liv. iii.

[67] *Hist. Parl.* t xxi. p. 259—276.

save mine!" Narbonne, Lally Tollendal, Bertrand de Moleville and others, had also offered their services. Both Malesherbes and Tronchet being old and feeble, they procured, with the consent of the Assembly, the aid of Desèze, a young and brilliant advocate of Bordeaux. When the King was arraigned, December 26th, Desèze made a powerful speech in his defence. Dividing the heads of accusation into things done before and things done after the King's acceptance of the Constitution, he argued that the former were covered by that act, the latter by the inviolability which the Constitution conferred upon him; and he concluded with a glowing eulogium on Louis's virtues, his benevolence, his mildness, and his justice. After his counsel had concluded, the King read a short address, in which he only protested against the imputation of having shed his subjects' blood on August 10th.[68]

After Louis had retired it was decreed, on the motion of Couthon, that the debate on the judgment of Louis Capet should be continued without interruption till sentence had been pronounced. The Girondists, either from a sentiment of compassion, or for their own political ends, wished to save the King's life; and with this view they proposed an appeal to the people, which, *as sovereign*, possesses the prerogative of mercy, and ought, therefore, to be consulted. This was opposed by Robespierre and Marat. Robespierre, the cold-blooded and sophistical disciple of Rousseau, now showed, by excellent arguments, the absurdity and inconvenience of consulting the people on affairs of State;[69] yet, if they were competent to decide any political question at all, surely none more simple could be submitted to them than that of the condemnation or acquittal of the King. The appeal was lost; and it was decided that the question, as to the King's guilt, should be put on January 14th 1793. The Convention, during the interval, exhibited scenes of the most extraordinary violence. To work upon the passions of the people and of the deputies, a procession of the wounded of August 10th, accompanied by the widows and orphans of the slain, defiled through the Convention; the orator of the Sections called for the death of Louis, the infamous assassin of thousands of Frenchmen![70] In discussing the King's fate, the Girondists and Mountaineers seemed, observes M. L. Blanc, to be contending over his corpse. The members of the different sides rushed upon one another as if about to engage in a general fight; vociferous cries continued for hours, during which nobody could be

[68] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxii. p. 57.
[69] *Ibid.* p. 103 sqq.
[70] *Ibid.* p. 131 sqq.

heard; the President broke his bell in vain attempts to restore order.

On January 14th the three following questions were submitted to the Convention:—1. Is Louis guilty? 2. Shall the decision of the Assembly on this point, whatever it may be, be submitted to the people for ratification? 3. What punishment has Louis incurred?

The first of these questions was decided almost unanimously in the affirmative. The second was negatived by a majority of 423 against 281. The debate on the King's punishment commenced on January 16th. The public flocked to the sitting, as to a fête or opera; bets were made upon the result; women, elegantly dressed and decked with tricolour ribbons, filled the tribunes; wine and refreshments circulated; any trivial incident, as the appearance of a sick deputy carried in to vote, excited the mirth of this gay and heartless crowd; among it might be observed a few serious faces, while some were marked with ferocity and fury.

Danton, who had returned to Paris only that day, proposed and carried a motion, that the King's fate should be decided by an absolute majority, instead of a majority of two-thirds, as usual in criminal cases. It had been determined that the members should give their votes by the *appel nominal*, that is, by calling their names. This was commenced at eight o'clock on the evening of the 16th. Already some twenty votes had been recorded, most of them for death, when the name of Vergniaud was called, the eloquent leader of the Gironde. A breathless silence prevailed; his vote would probably guide the rest of his party, and thus decide the King's fate. It was for death! but he asked, with a sort of shuffling evasion, as if ashamed of his vote, whether execution would be deferred? Philippe Égalité pronounced his relative's condemnation without any visible emotion, observing: "Guided only by duty, and persuaded that those who have attempted, or shall attempt, anything contrary to the sovereignty of the people deserve to die, I vote for death!" The *appel* lasted till the evening of January 17th, when the votes were declared. As 721 members were present, the absolute majority would be 361, and exactly this number of members voted for death unconditionally; 26 more pronounced the same sentence, but with conditions, making the total majority 387. On the other side, 334 voted for banishment, imprisonment, &c., including 46 who were for death with reprieve.[71] Vergniaud, as President of the Convention, now

[71] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p 206.

pronounced the sentence of death. The King's counsel offered some objections to the proceedings, but they were overborne by Robespierre, and the sitting was closed.

On January 19th, Brissot and others proposed that the King's execution should be deferred, on the political ground that it would alienate the friends of the Revolution in England and America; but Barère opposed the motion, and it was decided by a majority of 380 against 310 that Louis should be executed within twenty-four hours.[72] Next day, the Executive Council, and Garat, as minister of justice, officially announced to the King his sentence, which he had previously learnt from Malesherbes. Louis heard his doom without emotion. He made three requests: a respite of three days to prepare himself for death, the services of a priest, and an interview with his family: the last two only were granted. He slept peacefully the night before his execution, and being awakened at five in the morning (January 21st) by his faithful valet, Cléry, received the sacrament at the hands of the Abbé Edgeworth de Firmont. Having had an interview the day before with his family, he resolved not to see them again, in order to spare them the pain of a last separation.

At nine o'clock Santerre arrived with a military force to conduct Louis to the scaffold. The Abbé Edgeworth seems to have entertained a hope that he would be rescued,[73] and something of this sort had been mentioned to the King by M. de Malesherbes; but Louis expressed his disapproval of any such attempt, and said that he would rather die.[74] The melancholy procession passed in unbroken silence through the streets, except a few cries of "Mercy! mercy!" from some women. It arrived at the foot of the scaffold, which had been erected in the Place de la Révolution (now Place de la Concorde), a few minutes before ten o'clock. A little delay occurred from the King's unwillingness to take off his coat, and again from his repugnance to have his hands tied. He attempted to address the people, but the brutal Santerre drowned his voice by ordering the drums to beat, and all that could be heard was a protestation that he died innocent. After the *guillotine* had done its office, the executioner, Sanson, held up the King's head, and the crowd shouted, "The Republic for ever!" Louis XVI. was thirty-nine years of age, of which he had reigned eighteen. His remains were carried to the church of the Madeleine, and consumed with quicklime.[75]

[72] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 269.

[73] *Memoirs of the Abbé Edgeworth*, p. 78 (London, 1815).

[74] *Notes of Madame d'Angoulême*, ap. Croker, *Essays, &c.*, p. 257.

[75] M. L. Blanc, who represents the conduct of Louis on this occasion in the most invidious light, affirms among other things

The murder of Louis XVI., for such it must be called, created a great sensation throughout Europe. A general mourning was assumed in England and other countries. The Empress of Russia interdicted all commerce with France, and expelled the French from her dominions, unless they abjured revolutionary principles, and renounced all commerce with their native country.[76] Spain prepared to take up arms, nor could the sentiments of the Court of Naples be doubtful, where Caroline of Austria, sister of Marie Antoinette, ruled in the name of her husband. The Papal Court had denounced the proceedings in France before the King's execution, and Basseville, the French secretary of Legation at Rome, had been murdered for taking down the royal arms at his hotel, and substituting those of the Republic. Spain alone, however, of all the neutral Powers, had made any attempt to save Louis; but the Convention refused to consider the application.[77] The Marquis of Lansdowne and Mr. Fox in the British Parliament had moved for some intervention in favour of the King, and the opposition of Mr. Pitt and the ministry has been attributed even by recent French historians to the most sinister and unworthy motives.[78] But, as Mr. Pitt stated in the House of Commons, the intervention of England would only have alarmed the national pride and jealousy of the French, and have hurried on the very crime which it was intended to prevent; nor could Fox deny the justice of this view.[79] Such, undoubtedly, would have been the effect in the relations then existing between England and France, which we must here briefly describe.

Immediately after August 10th, Lord Gower, the English ambassador, had been recalled from Paris, on the ground that his credentials were annulled by the imprisonment of the King; but he was instructed, while professing the determination of his royal master to observe a strict neutrality in respect to the settlement of the French Government, to express his solicitude for the situation of Louis XVI. and his family, and to deprecate any act of violence towards them.[80] The Marquis de Chauvelin, the French ambassador

that he had a sort of struggle with the executioner; but nothing of the kind appears in the extracts from the newspapers in the *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 298 sq., giving an account of his death. M. Blanc seems strangely to have overlooked Sanson's letter to the editor of the *Thermomètre du jour*. Surely there could not have been better authority. See Croker, p. 255.

[76] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 191; Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 195.

[77] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxii. p. 98; Montgaillard, t. iii. p. 314.

[78] Michelet, *Hist. de la Rév. Fr.*, t. v. p. 318; L. Blanc, *Ibid.*, t. viii. p. 92, &c. M. Blanc charges Pitt with displaying "le sang-froid le plus cruel," p. 96, a charge rather amusing in the mouth of a defender of the regicides.

[79] Adolphus, *Reign of George III.*, vol. v. p. 264.

[80] *Instructions* to Lord Gower, *Ibid.*, p. 263.

at London, with whom M. Talleyrand, Bishop of Autun, was associated as a sort of Mentor, also ceased from the same period, and for similar reasons, to be recognised by the English Court in his official capacity, though he was allowed to remain at London. But, between the French King's imprisonment and execution, the British Cabinet found several just causes of complaint against the proceedings of the Convention, not at all connected with their internal administration. They were chiefly three:[81] viz. 1. a decree of November 19th (subsequently complemented by another of December 15th), by which they had established a system of revolutionary propagandism and conquest, by directing their generals to proclaim, in the countries which they entered, fraternity, liberty, and equality, the sovereignty of the people, the suppression of the existing authorities, &c. Peoples who refused or renounced liberty and equality were to be treated as enemies. That these principles were also to be applied to England, was shown by the receptions publicly given in France to the King's seditious subjects; 2. A project for the invasion of Holland by the Republican armies in Belgium, which had begun to be canvassed by French statesmen after the battle of Jemappes;[82] 3. the proclamation by the French of the freedom of the Scheldt (November 22nd 1792), showing a total disregard and contempt of the rights of neutral nations. That river had been closed by the Treaty of Münster, confirmed by the Treaty of Fontainebleau between the Emperor, as sovereign of the Netherlands, and the United Provinces, *under French mediation*, November 8th 1785. Yet the Convention haughtily proclaimed that the obstruction of rivers was contrary to those natural rights which all Frenchmen had sworn to maintain, a relic of feudal servitude and an odious monopoly. No treaties, it was asserted, could authorise such concessions, and the glory of the Republic demanded that liberty should be established and tyranny overthrown wherever her arms prevailed.[83] Nor was this decree a mere *brutum fulmen*; several French vessels of war had forced a passage up the Scheldt in order to bombard Antwerp. These complaints were aggravated by the insolent and offensive tone in which the minister Lebrun, as he publicly announced to the Convention, instructed M. de Chauvelin to reply to them; namely, by attempting to separate the British ministry from the British people, and to establish the latter

[81] See Lord Grenville's *letter* in answer to M. Chauvelin's note, *State Papers*, *Ann. Register*, 1793.

[82] See Brissot's *Letter* to Dumouriez, in *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 159.

[83] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxi. p. 351 sqq. *Ann. Register*, 1792, p. 356.; *Ibid.* 1793, Lord Grenville's *Letter* to M. de Chauvelin; Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 68.

as the proper judge of the questions at issue; a process, it was intimated, that might lead to consequences of which the Cabinet of St. James' had little dreamt.[84]

Thus France, regardless of all existing treaties, even though sanctioned by her own former government, was to be the self-constituted arbiter of all international questions; wherever, at least, her arms and her proselyting spirit might prevail. England was called on to resist such pretensions, not alone from motives of general policy, but also by her positive engagements towards Holland, entered into by the Treaty of the Hague, April 15th 1788.[85] Other grounds of complaint against France were, the annexation of Avignon, Savoy, and Nice, the conquest of Austrian Flanders, &c.; though French statesmen plausibly maintained that these aggregations sufficed only to balance the gains of Austria, Prussia, and Russia by the dismemberment of Poland.[86] A more particular cause of offence was the attempt to propagate revolutionary ideas in England by means of Jacobin agents, and even, it was supposed, through Talleyrand and Chauvelin, the French ministers in London.

The French Revolution had given birth to several democratic and revolutionary clubs in England, and had communicated fresh activity to those which previously existed. Such were the Constitutional Society, the London Corresponding Society, the Friends of the People, &c. The greater part of these societies were in correspondence with the Jacobin Club; nay, their seditious addresses, though expressing the sentiments of only a small portion of the British people, were publicly and favourably received by the Convention. Thomas Payne, an active agent in the French Revolution, had published this year in England the concluding part of his *Rights of Man*; in which he attempted to show that the English Government was utterly bad, and incited the people to mend it by following the example of the French; and a cheap edition of the work had been published to enable every class to read it. Monge, the French Minister of Marine, had written to the Jacobin societies in the seaport towns of France, December 31st 1792, threatening to make a descent on England, hurl thither 50,000 caps of liberty, destroy the tyranny of the government, &c.[87] Pitt attached, perhaps, more than their due weight to these and some similar proceedings, which, relying on the good sense of the English people, he might securely have despised. But they were never-

[84] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 149.
[85] Garden, t v. p. 89.
[86] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 136.
[87] *Homme d'état*, t. ii p. 177; Smyth's *Lectures*, vol. iii. p. 33.

theless acts of hostility, and therefore afforded just ground of complaint.

In this state of feeling between the two nations, the English Government had adopted some measures of a hostile tendency so early as the month of November 1792. The circulation of *assignats* in England was prohibited; the Government was empowered to prevent the exportation of arms, ammunition, and naval stores; the sending of corn and flour *to France* was forbidden, an invidious measure. On December 1st, a proclamation appeared for embodying the militia. The English Ministry appear to have now determined on war. Towards the end of November they had made communications to the Court of Vienna tending to reanimate the Coalition.[88] To baffle that league, the French Provisional Executive Council had made in September a ridiculous proposal to the English Cabinet to offer the title of *King of the French* to the Duke of York. This, of course, was not listened to, though after the battle of Jemappes, the English Ministry, alarmed for the safety of Holland, appear to have entered into some negociations with the French for establishing in Belgium a prince of the House of Hanover.[89]

The Parliament, which had been prorogued to January 3rd, was summoned to meet December 13th 1792, when the King, after lamenting in his speech the attempts at sedition in England, pursued in concert with persons in foreign countries, remarked: "that he had observed a strict neutrality in the war, and abstained from interference in the internal affairs of France; but he could not without serious uneasiness observe the strong and increasing indications in that country of an intention to excite disturbances in other states, to disregard the rights of neutral nations, and to pursue views of conquest and aggrandisement, as well as to adopt towards his allies, the States-General (who had been equally neutral), measures neither conformable to the law of nations nor to the positive stipulations of existing treaties. Under these circumstances, he had taken steps for augmenting his naval and military force, and by a firm and temperate conduct to preserve the blessings of peace." [90] This statement may be regarded as the English manifesto. A few days after Lord Grenville introduced an Alien Bill, by which foreigners were placed under surveillance.

All these were no doubt hostile steps, and the French added to them the shelter which their emigrants found in England. The dismissal of M. Chauvelin from England on receipt of the intelli-

[88] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 133 sqq.
[89] *Ibid.* p. 131.
[90] Adolphus, *George III.*, vol. v. p. 237.

gence of the King's execution, January 24th 1793, completed the list of offences by which France might consider herself aggrieved. The English Ministry of course foresaw that this step would produce a declaration of war on the part of France; and on the 28th the King sent a message to Parliament that, "in consequence of the atrocious act recently perpetrated at Paris," it would be necessary to increase the military and naval forces.[91] The question therefore arises, were the ministry justified in thus provoking a war? In considering this question we must remember that the English Cabinet did not wish for a war, had done all they could to avoid one. Pitt's policy had been essentially pacific, directed towards the financial and domestic interests of the country, to which a war would be highly injurious; nay, in common with a large portion of his countrymen, he had viewed with satisfaction the commencement of the French Revolution, and had expressed his wish to see a solid liberty established in France.[92] Brissot himself, a leading member of the Committee of General Defence, and one of the most ardent promoters of a war, was compelled to acknowledge that up to August 1792, England had observed a scrupulous neutrality, though he of course attributes it to unworthy motives.[93] The English Government, at the request of the French, had prohibited their officers and soldiers from entering the armies of the Coalition. Nay, they had even used their influence to prevent the States-General from joining Austria and Prussia.[94]

In truth, a peace policy would have been simply impossible. The leading members of the Whig party supported Pitt's views, and even Fox himself was compelled to acknowledge that ground for complaint existed.[95] When Fox ventured to divide the House he constantly found himself in small minorities, and it is plain that he could not have carried on the government a single week. For the views of the Ministry were those of the great majority of the nation. An almost universal feeling had been excited against the French by the aggressions before mentioned, inflamed by horror and disgust at the September massacres.[96] This feeling, which is

[91] *Ann. Register*, 1793. A secret negociation for peace, conducted at London, by Maret, afterwards Duke of Bassano, at the instigation of Dumouriez, who was now willing to relinquish the conquest of Holland, for the sake of preserving Flanders, came to nothing. *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 155 sqq.

[92] See his speech of Feb. 9th 1790, in Earl Stanhope's *Life of Pitt*, vol. ii. p. 48.

[93] See his *Rapport* to the Convention, Jan. 12th 1793, in *Hist. Parl.*, t. xxiii. p. 64.

[94] Massey's *Reign of George III.*, vol. iv. p. 2. The English grounds for a war will be found very clearly and forcibly stated in this work, ch. xxxiii.

[95] *Ibid.* p. 6.

[96] Brissot, in the report before quoted, confesses that the massacres had alienated the English. *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiii. p. 69.

displayed in the parliamentary speeches of the period, must have been much stronger than anything we can now imagine, and was highly creditable to the English people.[97] But even had the nation suppressed this natural indignation, connived at the insolence and aggressions of the French, and basely truckled to a government of assassins, would war have been avoided? No. The Girondists had determined on propagating their principles of liberty and equality, or rather their own dominion under those sacred names, with the sword. Brissot, in a letter to one of the French ministers, observes: "Set fire to the four corners of Europe,—there lies our safety."[98] "The national thought and the plan of the Girondists," observes a recent French historian of the Revolution, "*decided on a long while beforehand*, was to take the offensive *in all quarters*, to launch *throughout the world* the crusade of liberty."[99]

The French Government had anticipated the dismissal of M. Chauvelin by recalling him; and on February 1st 1793 the Convention unanimously declared war against the King of England and the Stadtholder of the United Provinces.[100] Yet, at this time, negociations were going on between Lord Auckland, the English minister at the Hague, and Dumouriez, with the view of preserving peace, and a conference had been fixed for February 10th at Mardyck; though it is probable that neither party was sincere.[101] Soon after declaring war, the Convention decreed a levy of 500,000 men, and assumed the superintendence of the armies by means of nine commissaries armed with power to remove those who were incapable, to punish those who were indifferent, to annihilate (*foudroyer*) traitors. A progressive income-tax was assessed on the rich, and all Frenchmen between the ages of eighteen and forty, being bachelors or widowers without children, were held in permanent requisition for the war.

Thus was initiated by far the greatest struggle ever witnessed by modern Europe, or perhaps by all time; a war that was to last with little intermission more than twenty years, and to be concluded only by the exhaustion of France, and it may almost be said of Europe combined against her. Austria and Prussia had, indeed, commenced the war; but those Powers would speedily have retired from the contest had not Great Britain intervened;

[97] "Si l'on avait vu la nation Anglaise envoyer des ambassadeurs à des assassins, la vraie force de cette isle merveilleuse, la confiance qu'elle inspire, l'aurait abandonnée." Mad. du Staël, *Considérations, &c.*, *Œuvres*, t. xiii. p. 98.

[98] "Incendiez les quatre coins de l'Europe, nôtre salut est là." Ap. Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. v. p. 350.

[99] Michelet, *Ibid.*, p. 342.

[100] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiv. p. 204.

[101] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 181.

and this country must be regarded as the main prop of all the coalitions subsequently formed against France. Both England and France seem to have underrated each other's resources. Brissot concludes the report already referred to with a most depreciatory account, which it is curious to read at the present day, of the resources and population of England, and of the precarious tenure of her colonies, especially India. British statesmen seem also to have undervalued the power of France, and to have concluded that internal anarchy would, before long, compel her to succumb. Pitt was of opinion that the war would be ended in one, or, at most, two campaigns. Lord Grenville even thought that the capture of Toulon would be a decisive blow.[102] But the social earthquake which had shaken France to her foundations, and seemed to threaten her with dissolution, was, in fact, the secret of her strength. A French political writer of those times, and a royalist, observes: "The Republic is richer and puts forth more resources than all the sovereigns of the Coalition together; for it employs the national riches of an empire accumulated during a century against the scanty revenues of a few princes."[103]

After the declaration of war, Great Britain proceeded to conclude a series of treaties with various Powers, which we shall here record together, though some of them were not made till several months later. A treaty with Hanover, March 4th 1793, for 15,000 men, augmented by 5000 in January 1794.[104] A double treaty with Russia, at London, March 25th 1793—one commercial, the other directed against France.[105] The ports of both countries were to be shut against France; no provisions were to be exported thither; her commerce was to be molested; neutrals were to be hindered from assisting her. This clause was intended to cut off the commerce of France with her colonies by means of neutral vessels. Notwithstanding this treaty, however, the Empress Catherine took no part in the war upon the Continent, directing all her efforts against Poland, though she sent a fleet into the Baltic and North Sea in August to assist in intercepting the commerce of neutrals with France. A treaty with Sardinia, April 25th. The King of Sardinia to keep on foot an army of 50,000 men during the war, receiving a subsidy of 200,000*l.* sterling per annum. Great Britain to send a fleet into the Mediterranean.[106] A treaty with Spain, May 25th. Both countries to shut their

[102] See *Life of Wilberforce*, and *Courts and Cabinets of George III.*, ap. Massey, vol. iv. p. 45 note.

[103] Mallet du Pan's *Resumé*, drawn up for Lord Elgin, *Mém. et Corr. de Mallet du Pan*, t. ii. p. 20.

[104] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 422. (2de Ed.)

[105] *Ibid.* pp. 433, 439; Garden, t. v. p. 202.

[106] *Ibid.* p. 462.

ports against French vessels and to prevent neutral vessels from aiding French commerce.[107] A treaty with the King of the Two Sicilies, July 12th, who was indignant at having been forced to recognise the French Republic. Great Britain undertook to maintain a respectable fleet in the Mediterranean, while the King of the Two Sicilies was to provide 6000 soldiers, four ships of the line, and four smaller vessels.[108] A treaty between England and Prussia at the camp before Mentz, July 14th, for the most perfect union and confidence in carrying on the war against France.[109] Subsequently converted into a treaty of Subsidies. A treaty at London, August 30th, between Great Britain and the Emperor.[110] Portugal also entered into the Coalition by a treaty signed at London, September 26th, by which she undertook to shut her ports against the French during the war, and to prohibit her subjects from carrying warlike stores and provisions to France.[111] Treaties for troops were also concluded with some of the smaller German States.

Thus, all the Christian Powers except Sweden, Denmark, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, Switzerland, Venice, and Genoa, entered successively into the League against France, which remained completely isolated and dependent on her own resources. The Convention had unanimously declared war against Spain, March 7th 1793. The Spanish Court had been disposed to war chiefly by the counsels of Don Emanuel Godoy, and in opposition to the opinion of the Count d'Aranda. Charles IV., who had succeeded his father Charles III. in 1788, and who, as Prince of Asturias, had displayed the most ungovernable violence of temper, manifested after his accession quite a contrary disposition, the result, it is said, of an illness with which he was afflicted. He was destitute neither of intelligence nor education; his heart was good, his judgment sound; but he was of a pusillanimous temper, and of so idle a disposition that anything requiring thought and application became a fatigue. His sole delight was in the chase, and, in order to enjoy it without interruption, he gladly resigned affairs of State into the hands of his Queen, Maria Louisa, daughter of the last Duke of Parma. Unfortunately, Maria Louisa was an artful, violent, and vindictive woman, of dissolute morals, vulgar mind, and imperious temper. She gladly seized the reins of power, though totally unqualified to rule, and she handed them over to a favourite not much better fitted for the task than herself. Don Emanuel Godoy, born at Badajoz in 1767 of a poor but noble family, has, perhaps, in

[107] Garden, t. v. p. 204.
[108] Martens, t. v. p. 480. (2de Ed.)
[109] *Ibid.* p. 483.
[110] *Ibid.* p. 447.
[111] *Ibid.* p. 519.

some respects been defamed by the envy which his success could not fail to attract. He seems naturally to have possessed a good understanding and a humane temper; he was well acquainted with mankind, and used his knowledge with tact. But he was so ignorant that he could not even speak his own language correctly, and was deficient in grace and dignity of manner. He owed his advancement to his personal beauty. He attracted the notice of the Queen, and was suddenly advanced from the station of a simple *garde du corps* to manage the affairs of Spain. Charles IV. showed an entire submission to his queen; Godoy also became his favourite and prime minister, and was loaded with favours and distinctions. But this sudden elevation perverted all his natural good qualities. He became idle and avaricious, fond of show, extravagantly ambitious, corrupted and debauched. Modern history presents few instances of a crowned head and a favourite who have made a more frightful use of their power, or more shamelessly abused a great and generous nation.

CHAPTER V.

While the French were thus throwing down the gauntlet to all Europe, their own country seemed sinking into anarchical dissolution. Paris was filled with tumult, insurrection, and robbery. At the denunciations of Marat against "forestallers," the shops were entered by the mob, who carried off articles at their own prices, and sometimes without paying at all. The populace was agitated by the harangues of low itinerant demagogues. Rough and brutal manners were affected, and all the courtesies of life abolished. The revolutionary leaders adopted a dress called the *carmagnole*, consisting of enormous black pantaloons, a short jacket, a three-coloured waistcoat, and a Jacobite wig of short black hair, a terrible moustache, the *bonnet rouge*, and an enormous sabre.[1] Moderate persons of no strong political opinions were denounced as "suspected,"[2] and their crime stigmatised by the newly coined word of *moderantisme*. The variations of popular feeling were recorded like the heat of the weather, or the rising of a flood. The principal articles in the journals were entitled "Thermometer of the Public Mind;" the Jacobins talked of the necessity of being "up to the level." Many of the provinces were in a disturbed state. A movement had been organising in Brittany ever since 1791, but the death of the Marquis de la Rouarie, its principal leader, had for the present suspended it. A more formidable insurrection was preparing in La Vendée. Chiefly agricultural, with few roads or large towns, and thus almost isolated from the rest of France, La Vendée had been little infected by the new opinions. It contained a class of haughty gentlemen, warmly attached to their ancient feudal customs and privileges, who had not joined the emigration, and still resided on their estates; while the peasantry were superstitiously devoted to their priests. La Vendée, from its undulating surface, numerous streams, narrow roads, and the cover afforded by hedges and small woods, is well adapted to defensive warfare. On March 10th 1793, the day

[1] *Carmagnole* was also the name of a tune and of a dance.
[2] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxiv. p. 421.

appointed for levying men for the war, the insurrection broke out at several points at once, principally under the leadership of Cathelineau, a working man, Stofflet, a game-keeper, and Athanase Charette, a naval officer styling himself Le Chevalier Charette. They were afterwards joined by Henry de la Rochejaquelein, Bonchamps, De Lescure, D'Elbée, and others; under whose auspices a force was raised of some 40,000 or 50,000 men, in seven divisions of unequal size. In the course of April and May they took Bressuire, Thouars, Parthenay and other places, and they addressed applications for assistance to England and Spain.

It was in the midst of these disturbances, aggravated by a suspicion of General Dumouriez's treachery, which we shall presently have to relate, that the terrible court known as the REVOLUTIONARY TRIBUNAL was established. It was first formally proposed in the Convention March 9th, by Carrier, the miscreant afterwards notorious by his massacres at Nantes, urged by Cambacérès on the 10th, and completed that very night at the instance of Danton, who rushed to the tribune, insisted that the Assembly should not separate, till the new Court had been organised. The Girondists had hoped at least to adjourn the subject; but Danton told them in his terrible voice, that there was no alternative between the proposed tribunal and the more summary method of popular vengeance. The extraordinary tribunal of August 1792 had not been found to work fast enough, and it was now superseded by this new one, which became in fact only a method of massacring under the form of law. The Revolutionary Tribunal was designed to take cognisance of all counter-revolutionary attempts, of all attacks upon liberty, equality, the unity and indivisibility of the Republic, the internal and external safety of the State. A commission of six members of the Convention was to examine and report upon the cases to be brought before it, to draw up and present the acts of accusation. The tribunal was to be composed of a jury to decide upon the facts, five judges to apply the law, a public accuser, and two substitutes; from its sentence there was no appeal.[3]

Meanwhile Dumouriez had returned to the army, very dissatisfied that he had failed in his attempts to save the King and baffle the Jacobins. He had formed the design of invading Holland, dissolving the Revolutionary Committee in that country, annulling the decree of Dec. 15th, offering neutrality to the English, a suspension of arms to the Austrians, reuniting the Belgian and

[3] See the decree for the organisation of the tribunal in *Hist. Parl.* t. xxv. p. 59 sq.; Cf. Croker, *Essays*, &c., p. 445.

Batavian republics, and proposing to France a re-union with them. In case of refusal, he designed to march upon Paris, dissolve the Convention, extinguish Jacobinism; in short, to play the part of Monk in England.[4] This plan was confided to four persons only, among whom Danton is said to have been one; it is, at all events, certain that he supported Dumouriez at this time, as appears from his praises of him in the Convention.[5]

Dumouriez, having directed General Miranda to lay siege to Maestricht, left Antwerp for Holland, Feb. 22nd, and by March 4th had seized Breda, Klundert, and Gertruydenberg. Austria, at the instance of England, had pushed foward 112,000 men under Prince Josias of Saxe-Coburg. Clairfait, with his army, at this time occupied Berghem, where he was separated from the French only by the little river Roer and the fortress of Juliers. Coburg, having joined Clairfait, March 1st, crossed the Roer, defeated the French under Dampierre at Altenhoven, and thus compelled Miranda to raise the siege of Maestricht, and retire towards Tongres. Aix-la-Chapelle was entered by the Austrians after a smart contest, and the French compelled to retreat upon Liége, while the divisions under Stengel and Neuilly, being cut off by this movement, were thrown back into Limburg. The Austrians then crossed the Meuse, and took Liége, March 6th.

Dumouriez was now compelled to concentrate his forces at Louvain. From this place he wrote a threatening letter to the Convention, March 11th, denouncing the proceedings of the ministry, the acts of oppression committed in Belgium, and the Decree of December 15th.[6] This letter threw the Committee of General Defence into consternation. It was resolved to keep it secret, and Danton and Lacroix set off for Dumouriez's camp, to try what they could do with him, but found him inflexible. His proceedings had already unmasked his designs. At Antwerp he had ordered the Jacobin Club to be closed, and the members to be imprisoned, at Brussels he had dissolved the legion of *sans-culottes*.

Dumouriez was defeated by Prince Coburg at Neerwinden, March 18th, and again on the 22nd at Louvain. In a secret interview with the Austrian Colonel Mack, a day or two after, at Ath, he announced to that officer his intention to march on Paris and establish a constitutional monarchy, but nothing was said as to who was to wear the crown. The Austrians were to support

[4] See *Mém.* de Dumouriez, t. iv. liv. viii. ch. i.

[5] Sitting of March 10th, *Hist. Parl.*, t. xxv.

[6] It is in the Appendix to Dumouriez's *Mémoires*, t. iii. note D.

Dumouriez's advance upon Paris, but not to show themselves except in case of need, and he was to have the command of what Austrian troops he might select.[7] The French now continued their retreat, which, in consequence of these negociations, was unmolested. The Archduke Charles and Prince Coburg entered Brussels March 25th, and the Dutch towns were shortly after retaken.

When Dumouriez arrived with his van at Courtrai, he was met by three emissaries of the Jacobins, sent apparently to sound him. He bluntly told them that his design was to save France, whether they called him Cæsar, Cromwell, or Monk, denounced the Convention as an assembly of tyrants, said that he despised their decrees. All this the emissaries reported to the Convention on their return. At St. Amand he was met by Beurnonville, then minister of war, who was to supersede him in the command, and by four commissaries despatched by the Convention. Camus, one of these, presented to him, in the midst of his officers, a decree summoning him to the bar of the Convention. After an angry altercation, in which Dumouriez declared that he would not submit himself to the Revolutionary Tribunal so long as he had an inch of steel at his side, Camus boldly pronounced him suspended from his functions, whereupon Dumouriez called in some huzzars, and arrested the commissaries and Beurnonville, who were handed over to Clairfait, and ultimately carried to Maestricht.[8]

The allies were so sanguine that Dumouriez's defection would put an end to the Revolution, that Lord Auckland and Count Stahremberg, the Austrian minister, looking upon the dissolution and flight of the Convention as certain, addressed a joint note to the States-General, requesting them not to shelter such members of it as had taken any part in the condemnation of Louis XVI.[9] But Dumouriez's army was not with him. On the road to Condé he was fired on by a body of volunteers and compelled to fly for his life (April 4th). In the evening he joined Col. Mack, when they employed themselves in drawing up a proclamation in the name of Prince Coburg, which was published on the following day. Dumouriez ventured once more to show himself to his army, but was received with such visible marks of dissatisfaction, that he was compelled to return to the Austrian quarters at Tournay with a few companions, among whom was the Duke de Chartres. Thus terminated Dumouriez's political and military career.

The situation of France at this time seemed almost desperate.

[7] Dumouriez, *Mém.* t. iv. liv. viii. ch. viii.

[8] See the account of Camus, in Toulongeon, t. v. App. Dumouriez, *Mémoires*, t. iv. liv. viii. ch. xii.; *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 223.

[9] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 27 sqq.

The army of the North was completely disorganised through the treachery of Dumouriez; the armies of the Rhine and Moselle were retreating; those of the Alps and Italy were expecting an attack; on the eastern side of the Pyrenees the troops were without artillery, without generals, almost without bread, while on the western side the Spaniards were advancing towards Bayonne. Brest, Cherbourg, the coasts of Brittany, were threatened by the English. The ocean ports contained only six ships of the line ready for sea, and the Mediterranean fleet was being repaired at Toulon.[10] But the energy of the revolutionary leaders was equal to the occasion. The Convention seized the direction of military affairs, and despatched eight commissaries, among them Carnot, not only to superintend the operations of the army, but also to keep it under the surveillance of the Assembly. Dumouriez was declared a traitor, a price was set upon his head, and General Dampierre was appointed to his vacant place. In compliance with a petition of the *Commune*, it was voted that a camp of 40,000 men should be formed under the walls of Paris.

But the most important measure suggested by the present posture of affairs was the establishment of the *Comité de Salut Public*, or *Committee of Public Welfare*.[11] There already existed a *Comité de Sûreté Générale* (or Committee of General Safety), established October 2nd 1792. But the action of this committee, consisting of twenty-five members who wasted their time in debates, was found too dilatory, and the Committee of Public Welfare was therefore established, at the instance of Barère, April 6th 1793. It was to be composed of nine members of the Convention, who were to deliberate in secret, to watch over and accelerate the deliberation of the ministry, and to control the measures of the Executive Council. Thus it was in fact little short of a dictatorship of nine persons; though, by way of check upon them, they were to have no power over the national treasury, were to be renewed every month, and were to render to the Convention every week an account of their proceedings, and of the situation of the Republic.[12] The Girondists did not oppose the erection of this Committee. Nearly half its first members were indeed taken from the centre or the right of the Convention; the rest from the more moderate section of the Mountain, including, however, the terrible Danton. Robes-

[10] L. Blanc, t. viii. p. 318.

[11] This Committee is generally called by English writers the *Committee of Public Safety*, sometimes the *Committee of Public Salvation*. But the word *Wohlfahrt* (welfare), by which *salut* is rendered by German writers, seems nearer to its true meaning, and discriminates better the functions of the two Committees. To watch over the public *safety* or *security* (*sûreté*) was the object of the older Committee.

[12] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxv. p. 301.

pierre and the more violent Jacobins were not yet admitted; an exclusion which they resented by agitating and getting up inflammatory petitions.[13] After this period, the Committee of General Safety was charged with the administration of the police, became in fact a sort of executive power, while the functions of the new Committee were higher and more general, those indeed essentially of the Government. Nevertheless, the Committee of General Safety recognised no authority superior to its own, except the decrees of the Convention, till after the fall of the Girondists; when the Committee of Public Welfare, instead of consulting, began to dictate to it.[14]

By the creation of the Revolutionary Tribunal, and of the Committee of Public Welfare, all the instruments of the Reign of Terror had been provided; but Robespierre and the men who were to wield them were still in the background. The deadly struggle for place and power between the Gironde and the Mountain was, however, in progress. The Convention was the daily scene of the denunciations and quarrels of the two parties, which sometimes rose to such a pitch of violence that swords were drawn and the lives of the members threatened. The inviolability of the deputies had been abolished by a decree of April 1st, by which the two parties voted their right to proscribe one another. The populace was incited to agitate against the Girondists. On the 8th of April, a deputation from the Section Bon Conseil declared in the Convention that the public voice condemned Guadet, Gensonné, Brissot, Barbaroux, Louvet, Buzot, and other members of that party. On the same day the Convention had decreed that all the members of the Bourbon family, including Philippe Égalité, should be detained at Marseilles.[15] On the 15th of April a deputation from thirty-five of the forty-eight sections, headed by Pache, the mayor of Paris, presented to the Convention a petition demanding in the most violent language the expulsion of twenty-two of the leading Girondists; and when Fonfrède suggested an appeal to the sovereign people of France, in their primary assemblies, the *Commune*, by a fresh deputation, intimated that the Sections did not contemplate any such appeal, but required the punishment of the traitors—that is, in other words, the execution of a judgment not pronounced.[16] The Girondists did not venture to persist in their demand for an appeal, though they had a majority in the Assembly, and contented themselves with decreeing that the

[13] Michelet, t. v. p. 460 sq.
[14] Montgaillard, *Hist. de France, &c.*, t. iv. p. 25.
[15] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxv. p. 302, 310 sqq.
[16] *Ibid.* t. xxvi. pp. 3 and 16; Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, liv. x. ch. vii.

National Convention reprobated as calumnious the petition presented by the thirty-five Sections, and adopted by the Council General of the *Commune*; and with directing that this decree should be forwarded to the different departments.[17]

The Girondists, on their side, procured a decree for the arraignment of Marat before the Revolutionary Tribunal for having signed an incendiary address as president of the Jacobin Club. This most impolitic act resulted, as might have been foreseen, only in the triumph of Marat and the Jacobins, from which faction the jury of that tribunal were selected, and most of whose members were friends of Robespierre. Some of these jurymen were so ignorant that they could neither read nor write, others were habitually intoxicated.[18] The new tribunal had not yet done much business though it had perpetrated some most absurd and cruel acts, suc h as sending a poor kitchen-maid to the guillotine for having cried *Vive le Roi!* when drunk. When Marat surrendered himself prisoner he was treated with the most delicate attentions. He did not even pretend to defend himself; on the contrary he assumed the part of accuser instead of defendant, boasted of what he had done, and laid all the blame on the Girondists. He was of course immediately acquitted (April 24th). On his release the mob almost stifled him with kindness, crowned him with laurel, bore him on their shoulders to the hall of the Convention, through which they defiled amidst the cheers of the galleries and the ill-concealed fears of the deputies. At the Jacobins that evening Marat congratulated himself that he had put a rope round the necks of the Girondists.[19]

The Gironde made some feeble attempts to oppose the *Commune* and the Jacobins with their own weapons. The *Commune*, by a Decree of May 1st, had ordered a levy to be made in Paris of 12,000 men for the war in La Vendée, and had laid a heavy income-tax upon the rich. These measures excited great discontent among the clerks, apprentices, and other young men of the better classes subject to the conscription; riots ensued, which were stimulated by the *Gironde* and by articles in Brissot's *Patriote*. But such partisans were no match for a mob of *sans-culottes*, a regular army of whom was taken into pay at the instance of Robespierre.[20] The Girondists, after a vain attempt to remodel the Municipality, now obtained the appointment of a *Commission of Twelve*, armed with extraordinary power, and selected from their own party

[17] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxi. p. 84.
[18] *Procès Fouquier Tinville*, ap. Croker, *Essays, &c.*, p. 436.
[19] *Hist. Parl., Ibid.*, p. 144.
[20] Michelet, t. v. p. 515.

(May 18th).[21] This step tended to bring matters to an issue between the contending factions. The *Twelve*, by ordering the arrest of two administrators of police charged with provoking massacre, of a low demagogue named Varlet, and of Hébert, substitute of the *Procureur de la Commune*, and editor of the infamous journal called *Père Duchesne*, who in a calumnious article had threatened the Girondists with the *guillotine*, provoked a trial of strength between the parties. A deputation from the *Commune* appeared at the bar of the Convention, May 25th to demand that Hébert, "a magistrate estimable for his virtues and enlightenment," should be restored to his functions. Amidst the clamour which ensued, the Girondist Isnard, then president of the Assembly, in an angry and foolish speech declared, that France had confided the national representatives to Paris, and if they were attacked, he threatened in the name of all France that Paris should be annihilated, that the spot which it had occupied should soon be sought in vain.[22] The clamour with which this address was greeted may be imagined.

The Girondists had unquestionably a majority in the provinces. The walls of Bordeaux had been covered with placards threatening to revenge its deputies if killed; the party of Barbaroux at Marseilles had manifested anti-revolutionary sentiments, and Girondist addresses had been presented from that town, as well as from Bordeaux, Lyon, Avignon, Nantes, and other places.[23] But the fate of France was to be decided at Paris, and here the Girondists could reckon only on three of the forty-eight sections, the Butte-des-Moulins, Quatre-vingt-douze, and Du Mail. Robespierre, who had been gradually organising the means of overthrowing the Gironde, observed in the Jacobin Club, May 26th, "The Faubourg St. Antoine will crush the Section Du Mail. Generally speaking, the people should repose on their strength; but when all laws are violated, when despotism is at its height, they ought to rise. *This moment is come.* For my own part, I declare that I place myself in insurrection against the President and all the members of the Convention."[24] Some stormy scenes ensued in the Convention, and the decreasing majority in favour of the Gironde showed that the *Marais* was going over to the *Mountain*. The Assembly, menaced by a deputation, voted the release of Hébert and the other prisoners.

The insurrection which overthrew the Girondists was organised by commissaries from thirty-six of the sections, who met at the

[21] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 132.
[22] *Ibid.* p. 224 sqq.
[23] *Ibid.* p. 91, 153, 197, &c.
[24] *Ibid.* p. 243 sqq.

Evêché. They were about 500 in number, including 100 women, and assumed the name of the *Central Club*. The destruction of the *Gironde* was resolved on at a meeting of this assembly, May 29th; Robespierre, with his usual craft, withdrew as the moment of action approached. He observed that day at the Jacobin Club, "I cannot prescribe to the people the means by which it must save itself. I am exhausted by four years of revolution, and by the heart-rending spectacle of the triumph of tyranny. It is not for me to indicate the course of action. I am consumed by a slow fever, the fever of patriotism. I have spoken: I have no further duty to accomplish at this time."[25] But he had remarked that if the *Commune* did not join the people, it would violate its first duty.

Early in the morning of May 31st, the Central Club, having previously declared the *Commune* and the Department in a state of insurrection, sent commissaries to the Hôtel de Ville to declare that the people of Paris annulled the constituted Municipal authorities; and they exhibited the unlimited powers which they had received from thirty-three sections to save the Republic. Upon this the Municipal officers and General Council abdicated, but were immediately reinstated in their functions. The latter now assumed the title of *Revolutionary* Council General; an epithet which signified that all the usual laws and observances were suspended. Henriot, a brutal ruffian who had been a gentleman's servant, and afterwards a clerk at the barriers, was now named Provisional Commander-General of the Parisian forces.[26] In order to give the movement an appearance of order, and to convert it into what was called "a *moral* insurrection," the Jacobins had convened a meeting of deputies from the forty-eight sections and representatives of the authorities of the Department, who elected a commission of eleven, to be incorporated with the Council General of the *Commune*. These men pretended to restrain any open violence. But the Girondists were soon undeceived by the appearance of petitioners, violently demanding that the price of bread should be fixed at three livres, that workshops should be established to make arms for the *sans-culottes*, that commissaries should be sent to Marseilles and other southern towns, that the ministers Le Brun and Clavière should be arrested, that the obnoxious twenty-two members, as well as the twelve, should be arrested. Soon after arrived the members of the administration of the Department, the authorities of the *Commune*, and the

[25] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 297 sq. [26] *Ibid.* p. 306 sqq.

Commissaries of the Sections, accompanied by a crowd of savages armed with clubs, pikes, and other weapons. L'Huillier, the *procureur général Syndic*, their spokesman, denounced by name several of the leading Girondists, stigmatised the crime they had been guilty of in threatening to destroy Paris, the centre of the arts and sciences, the cradle of liberty. The populace now spread themselves in the Assembly, fraternised with the *Mountain*. In this scene of indescribable confusion Robespierre, adopting the vulgar prejudices of the day, demanded the accusation of "the accomplices of Dumouriez" and of all those named by the petitioners. Vergniaud, the orator of the Gironde, was too terrified to reply; in his alarm he had himself moved that the address of the previous petitioners should be printed and circulated in the Departments! The debate was closed by the adoption of a decree proposed by Barère, "That the armed force of the Department of Paris should be in permanent requisition till further orders; that the Committee of Public Welfare, in concert with the constitutional authorities, should investigate the plots denounced at the bar; that the Twelve should be suppressed; that a proclamation explaining these proceedings should be forwarded to all the Departments (May 31st).[27]

These measures, and especially the establishment of a permanent insurrectionary force with regular pay, convinced the Girondists that their power was at an end. Their discouragement was completed by the news that the men of the three sections on which they relied had fraternised with those of the Faubourg St. Antoine. Some now proposed to fly into the provinces and raise an insurrection, but this was negatived by the majority. On the following day they absented themselves from the Convention. When that body assembled June 2nd, it was surrounded by 80,000 armed men, with 163 guns. A scene of indescribable tumult and violence ensued. Hoping to overawe the people by the majesty of the National Assembly, Hérault de Séchelles, who that day presided, descended with the greater part of the members among the crowd, he himself with his hat on, the rest uncovered. Addressing Henriot, who with his staff was stationed in the court leading to the Carrousel,[28] he asked, What the people wanted? remarked that the Convention was occupied only with promoting its happiness. "The people," replied Henriot, pressing his hat over his brow with one hand, and drawing his sword with the other, "has not come here to listen to phrases but to give orders. What it wants is

[27] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 350 sq.

[28] The Convention had transferred their sittings from the *Manège* to the Tuileries, May 10th.

thirty-four criminals." Then, reining back his horse, he shouted in a voice of thunder, "Cannoniers to your guns!" The members of the Convention, after attempting a retreat through the gardens, from which they were driven by Marat and his myrmidons, were compelled to resume their sitting in profound dejection.

The *Commune* and the Jacobins were now victorious. A list of the deputies to be proscribed was read in the Convention; Marat added to or retrenched from it as he pleased.[29] A decree was passed for the arrest of twenty-one of the leading Girondists, including Vergniaud, Brissot, Gensonné, Guadet, Gorsas, Pétion, Barbaroux, Buzot, Rabaud St. Etienne, Lasource, Lanjuinais, Louvet, and others; also of the ministers Clavière and Le Brun, and of the whole Commission of Twelve except Fonfrède and St. Martin—in all thirty-three persons.[30] Isnard and Fouchet, having resigned their functions, were not arrested, but were forbidden to leave Paris. The proscribed Girondists were merely placed under the surveillance of *gendarmes*, from which most of them contrived to escape, and fled to the departments of the Eure and the Calvados, to Lyon, Nîmes, Moulins, and other places. Vergniaud, Valazé, and Gensonné remained in custody. Seventy-three deputies, who subsequently signed a protest against the arrest of the Girondists, were expelled from the Convention and imprisoned.[31]

Thus the *Gironde* fell by the same power it had itself employed to overwhelm the nobles, proscribe the priests, and sap the throne—the power of the Parisian mob. They had relied too much on their oratory, and their journals were vain enough to imagine that they could control the spirit which they had conjured up, and complacently assumed the name of *hommes d'état* or statesmen. They were indeed, by the admission of Danton himself, vastly superior to the *Montagne* in talents and education; "but," he added, "we have more audacity than they, and the *canaille* is at our command."[32] Such, no doubt, was the true state of the case. The Girondists had lost all influence with the mob, and it was not till too late that they attempted to find a counterpoise in the provinces. A strong reactionary spirit existed in many parts of France which required only leading, and the arrest of the Girondists was followed by some serious insurrections. At Caen an association, calling itself the "Central Assembly of resistance to oppression," published a violent manifest against the Jacobins of Paris. Two commis-

[29] *Mém. de Meillan*, ap. Blanc, *Révol. Fr.*, t. viii. p. 468.
[30] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxvii. p. 401.
[31] *Idem.* t. xxviii. p. 148.
[32] Prudhomme, ap. Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 287.

saries, Prieur and Romme, whom the Convention had despatched into the Calvados, were arrested and confined in the Castle of Caen. Felix Wimpfen, a brave soldier, who headed the insurrection in this quarter, failed however in the attempt to raise an army, and the Girondists, who had fled to the Calvados, now made their way to Quimper and embarked for Bordeaux. The authorities of this city had declared themselves in a state of provisional independence under the title of "Popular Commission of Public Safety." At Rennes, the primary assemblies had voted a violent address to the Convention. At Lyon, when news arrived of the insurrection in the Calvados, the citizens openly raised the standard of revolt, fortified the town, levied an army of 20,000 men, and opened communications with the emigrants and the King of Sardinia. Disturbances had broken out in this city before the end of May. The Girondists, united with the royalists, had had some serious rencounters with the republican party, led by Chalier, a member of the Municipality; the banner of the Gironde proved victorious, and Chalier was seized and executed July 16th. An army of counter-revolutionists, formed at Marseilles, and increased by battalions from Aix, Nimes, Montauban, Toulouse, and other places, marched towards Lyon, took possession of Avignon, Arles, and both banks of the Rhone; Carteaux, at the head of a small force, was the only obstacle to their junction with the Lyonese.

The death of Marat was another result of the fall of the Girondists. In the neighbourhood of Caen, whither many of them had fled, lived Charlotte Corday, a descendant, it is said, of a sister of the great Corneille. She was then about twenty-five years of age, having been born at St. Saturnin near Seez, in July 1768. A partisan of the Gironde, and enraged by its fall, she proceeded to Paris; obtained admission to Marat on pretence of giving him some valuable information on the state of the Calvados; found him in a bath, and plunged a knife into his breast with so determined a thrust that he expired in a few minutes (July 13th 1793). She attempted not to escape, and being condemned to death by the Revolutionary Tribunal, met her fate with serenity and courage. It was a just retribution that the apostle of massacre and murder should fall by the dagger of an assassin; but his death only enhanced his popularity and inaugurated his apotheosis. The blasphemous honours paid to the memory of so vile a wretch show the depravity and degradation of the public mind of France at that period. His heart, deposited in an agate vase, one of the most precious spoils of the *Garde Meuble*, was

exposed on an altar erected in the Luxembourg, amidst flowers and the smoke of incense, to the adoration of the Parisians, who sang litanies in its honour, in which it was compared with the heart of the Saviour![33] A sort of pyramid was also erected to his memory on the Carrousel, in the interior of which were placed his bust, bath, inkstand, and lamp. In November his remains were carried to the Pantheon in place of those of Mirabeau, which were ejected.

Amidst these dangers and alarms a new Constitution, drawn up from the ideas of Condorcet but modified by Robespierre, was decreed by the Convention, June 23rd, with a listlessness and apathy betraying their appreciation of its efficacy. It is unnecessary to describe the "Constitution of '93," or of An I, since it was soon virtually suspended by the dictatorial authority assumed by the Committee of Public Welfare. It was based on the principles current at that time of the sovereignty of the people, universal suffrage, liberty, equality, the fraternity of all mankind, &c.[34] Condorcet attacked it in a pamphlet, complained that his own ideas had been spoilt, that the new Constitution had been drawn up and passed with indecent haste at a time when the liberty of the national representatives had been grossly outraged, passed a glowing eulogium on the proscribed Girondists; for uttering which sentiments in this free republic he was denounced in the Convention by Chabot, July 8th, and a decree was issued for his arrest.[35] The widow of Louis François Vernet sheltered him a while in her house; but he was at length driven to commit suicide in order to avoid the guillotine. The new Constitution was also opposed by the extreme democratic party called the *enragés*, led by Varlet, Leclerc, Jacques Roux, an unfrocked priest, and other low demagogues. This faction attacked even the Mountain; but their chief objects were tumult and plunder. They got up a riot which lasted three days, during which, under the usual pretext of forestallers, they seized cargoes of soap and other articles, which they paid for at their own prices.[36]

It was fortunate for France during this domestic anarchy that the allies combined against her, divided by their own selfish views and jealousies, had no well-concerted plan of action. After the

[33] "O cor Jésus—O cor Marat.—Cœur sacré de Jésus—cœur sacré de Marat.—Vous avez les mêmes droits à nos hommages!" Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 439. The Cordeliers subsequently obtained possession of the heart, and suspended it from their roof. Here also it was addressed in prayer. *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 395.

[34] There is a brief analysis of it in Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 48 sq.

[35] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 271.

[36] *Ibid.* p. 216 sq.

flight of Dumouriez, General Dampierre, his successor, had collected the scattered remnants of the French army in a camp at Famars; and he proceeded to form entrenched camps at Cassel, Lille, Maubeuge, Charleroi, and Givet. The Imperial army under Prince Coburg had entered the French territory, April 9th, but the movements of that commander were as slow and indecisive as those of the Duke of Brunswick had been; and though Lille, Condé, Valenciennes, and Maubeuge were threatened, nothing of importance was done. Coburg was of opinion that the strife of parties would reduce France to a state of impotence, and that about the spring of 1794 an invasion might be securely undertaken. Hence he had already determined in April to attempt nothing further in the ensuing campaign of 1793 than the reduction of some frontier fortresses.[37] The Duke of York, with 10,000 English, having disembarked at Ostend, April 20th, proceeded to join the Dutch and Hanoverian divisions. Their united cantonments extended from Tournay and Courtrai to the sea. In vain the Duke of York and the Austrian general Clairfait urged an advance; Coburg would not stir. His views respecting the campaign were, no doubt, a good deal influenced by the Austrian policy at this time, which was to secure the reconquered Belgian provinces; the states of which were restored to their former rights, and the Archduke Charles was appointed Governor-General of the Austrian Netherlands. Attacks were made by the French with the view of saving Condé; against the better judgment of Dampierre, who saw their inutility, but was urged to them by the Convention. In one of these, May 8th, he sought and found his death in preference to the alternative of the *guillotine*. At length the allies attacked the French at Famars, and drove them from their camp, May 23rd. The victory was won by the Duke of York turning the French flank; Coburg had wasted his time in useless manœuvres.[38] A twelve days' march might now have brought the allies to Paris; but Coburg would not leave the frontier towns behind him. The French army, in a state of disorganisation, had retreated under the walls of Bouchain.

On the death of Dampierre, Custine, commander of the army of the Rhine, was appointed to his post. Before Custine's departure, Frederick William, soon after the battle of Neerwinden, had crossed the Rhine at Bacharach, dispersed some republican battalions, intercepted Custine's communications between Mentz and

[37] Mallet du Pan, *Mémoire* for Lord Elgin, *Mém. et Corr.*, t. i. p. 408; *Oestr. milit. Zeitschrift*, 1813, ap. Von Sybel, B. ii. S. 391.

[38] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 285.

Worms, and compelled him to retreat behind the Lauter. Custine was joined here by the army of the Moselle; but though he had 60,000 men against 40,000 Prussians, he ventured not to attack them. The Prussians, on their side, though reinforced by an Austrian corps under Wurmser, and by the emigrants under Condé, confined their whole attention to the reduction of Mentz. Custine, before proceeding to take the command of the army of the North, made a feeble and unsucessful effort to relieve that place (May 17th). He was succeeded in the command of the army of the Rhine by Houchard, and in that of the army of the Moselle by Alexander Beauharnais, husband of the celebrated Josephine.

Austria had resolved on occupying in her own name the French frontier fortresses; Great Britain was more intent on seizing the French possessions in the East Indies than on pushing the continental war with vigour; Prussia had little to gain in the struggle, but it was important for her to drive the French from Mentz, the key of Germany. Hence the mighty preparations of the allies for the campaign of 1793 were chiefly employed in the reduction of two towns, Mentz and Valenciennes! The former place capitulated to the Prussians July 22nd. Condé had surrendered to the Austrians July 12th; and on the 28th, Valenciennes also capitulated. Condé and Valenciennes were taken possession of in the name of the Emperor instead of that of the French King. *Monsieur*, who, after the execution of his brother Louis XVI., had assumed the title of Regent, and had named the Count d'Artois Lieutenant-General of France, sent a protest to all the cabinets of Europe against this dismemberment of the kingdom of his youthful nephew Louis XVII.[39] The garrisons of Mentz and Valenciennes, amounting to upwards of 20,000 men, were dismissed on condition of not bearing arms against the allies for a year; but this did not prevent the French from employing them with great effect against the Vendéans.[40] Custine, suspected of collusion with the enemy, had been summoned to Paris on the motion of Bazire, before the surrender of Valenciennes.[41] He was conveyed to the *Abbaye*. On the fall of Mentz his accusation was decreed; that of Valenciennes, the third town which he had neglected to succour, was fatal to him. He was condemned by the Revolutionary Tribunal and guillotined (August 28th). Robespierre, who was determined to have his blood, had denounced in the Jacobin Club the slowness of the proceedings against him. Kilmaine, his

[39] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 329.
[40] Montgaillard, t. iv. pp. 61, 64.
[41] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. p. 392. Robespierre had remarked at the Jacobin Club, June 12th, that it was necessary to strike at the generals. *Ibid.* p. 196.

successor, withdrew the army of the North, from Cæsar's camp before Bouchain, and established it with little molestation in a strong position behind the Scarpe, between Douai and Arras (August 10th).

While such was the posture of affairs on the northern frontier, a Spanish army under Don Ricardos had entered France on the eastern side of the Pyrenees, had laid siege to Perpignan, captured St. Laurent and the fort of Bellegarde. The Spaniards had also been successful on the western side of that chain, and menaced St. Jean Pié de Port. The Corsicans had risen in insurrection towards the end of May, at the instigation of Pascal Paoli, who was named Generalissimo or Governor of the island. The clergy reinstated, the emigrants recalled, the emissaries of the French Republic proscribed, and Corsica thrown into the hands of the English—such was the programme of the insurgents. Some slight successes in Piedmont were all that the French could set off against these reverses; but Nice and Villa Franca were threatened by a Spanish squadron, which expected to be joined by the English fleet.

The vigour of the Revolutionary Government seemed to increase as danger became wider and more imminent. Robespierre, on the retirement of Gasparin, had been admitted into the Committee of Public Welfare July 27th. But it was not till the spring of the following year that he attained to supreme authority. After the fall of the Girondists, the composition of the Committee had been altered by the introduction of members of the Mountain. Barère was indeed retained; but Couthon and St. Just were elected, and it was they who obtained the admission of Robespierre. The number of the Committee was raised to twelve, on the motion of Danton, Sept. 6th; when Billaud Varennes, Collot d'Herbois, and Granet were admitted. The members now divided themselves into smaller committees. Barère and Hérault de Séchelles assumed the Department of Foreign Affairs; Billaud Varennes and Collot d'Herbois that of the Interior; Robespierre and St. Just that of Legislation. The Ministers waited every evening on the Committee for instructions.[42]

The fresh organisation of the Committee was soon testified by its measures. On the 1st of August it was decreed that Marie Antoinette should be transferred to the Conciergerie and arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal; that the expenses of her children should be reduced to those necessary for two private individuals; that all the Capets should be banished, but Elizabeth

[42] Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 606.

not till after the judgment of Marie Antoinette; that the royal tomb and mausoleums at St. Denis and elsewhere should be destroyed on August 10th; that the expenses and equipages of general officers should be reduced to what was strictly necessary; that only patriotic expressions, or the names of ancient republicans and martyrs of liberty, should henceforth be employed as watch-words; that all foreigners belonging to countries at war with France, not domiciliated previously to July 14th 1789, should be arrested, and their papers seized; that the barriers of Paris should be closed, and nobody suffered to pass unless charged with a public mission; that a camp should be formed between Paris and the army of the North; that all Frenchmen refusing to receive *assignats* should be subject to a fine of 300 livres, and on a second offence of double that sum, with twenty years of imprisonment in irons.[43]

The decree against foreigners seems to have been suggested by the finding, as it was asserted, of some papers on the person of an Englishman arrested at Lille, which were said to implicate Mr. Pitt in a vast conspiracy to burn several of the French arsenals, to forestall articles of the first necessity, to depress the value of *assignats*, &c.[44] The papers are manifest forgeries, nor was the Englishman on whom they are said to have been found ever produced and examined. Garnier, however, proposed in consequence in the Convention, August 7th, that Pitt was the enemy of the human race, and that everybody was justified in assassinating him. At the instance of Couthon the latter clause was omitted, but the Convention solemnly decreed the former.[45]

On the 10th of August the establishment of the new Constitution was celebrated by a grand public melodramatic *fête*, arranged by the painter David. A few days after, it was decreed that, till the enemy was expelled from France, all Frenchmen were in permanent requisition for the armies. Bachelors were to enlist, married men were to forge arms and transport provisions; women were to make tents, clothing, &c.; children were to scrape lint; old men were to excite the warriors by preaching in public places hatred of kings and the unity of the Republic.[46] France became one vast camp. To stimulate the republicanism of the people, it was proposed to publish, under the title of *Annales du Civisme*, the most striking instances of patriotic devotion. The Committee of Public Welfare also directed that such tragedies as *Brutus*,

[43] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxviii. pp. 396—400. M. Blanc, t. ix. 194, gives these decrees imperfectly.

[44] See the papers, *Hist. Parl.*, *Ib.*, pp. 383 sqq.

[45] *Ibid.* p. 413.

[46] *Ibid.* p. 469.

William Tell, *Caius Gracchus*, &c., should be performed thrice a week, once at the public expense.[47]

When Robespierre urged on the death of Custine, he also complained of the dilatoriness of the Revolutionary Tribunal, which he said had "hampered itself with lawyer-like forms," and proposed that it should be reformed. At this time (August 26th), Robespierre first became President of the Convention. On Sept. 5th a decree was passed dividing the "Extraordinary Criminal Tribunal" into four sections, all acting simultaneously and with equal powers; increasing the number of judges to sixteen, including the President and Vice President, the number of the jury to sixty, and the substitutes of the public accusers to five.[48] Chaumette proposed a revolutionary army to traverse the Departments accompanied by the *guillotine*; and suggested that the gardens of the Tuileries should be used for plants serviceable in the hospitals. Danton, like Robespierre, complained of the slowness of the Revolutionary Tribunal—the head of an aristocrat should fall every day! He also procured two decrees: 1. That there should be an extraordinary assembly of the Sections every Sunday and Thursday, and that each citizen attending them should receive, if he wished it, forty *sous*; 2. That one hundred millions should be placed at the disposal of the Ministry to fabricate arms. These decrees were voted with enthusiasm. A deputation from the Jacobins demanded that the Girondists should be speedily brought to justice; a subject that had been agitated in the Jacobin Club a few days before. On the entrance of this deputation Robespierre, with his usual prudence, resigned the chair to Thuriot. Drouet, the post-master, who headed another deputation, exclaimed: "The hour is come to shed the blood of the guilty. Since our virtue, our moderation, and our philosophic ideas have affected nothing, let us become brigands for the public good. It suffices not merely to have arrested suspected persons; I entreat you to tell these *guilty men* that if liberty should be menaced, you will massacre them without pity." This was too much even for the Convention. Thuriot reminded the speaker that France did not thirst for blood, but justice.[49] Justice, however, as then practised, was only massacre under a new name. Towards the close of the sitting, Barère, as member of the Committee of Public Welfare, presented a Report embodying the prayers of the various petitions. Besides the measures already noticed, it was decreed that a standing army of 6000 men and 1200 gunners

[47] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 6 sq.
[48] *Ibid.* p. 48; *Moniteur*, No. 249, ap. Blanc, t. ix. p. 234.
[49] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 40 sqq.

should be maintained in Paris to execute revolutionary laws and measures of public safety; that Brissot, Vergniaud, Gensonné, Clavière, Le Brun, and his secretary Baudry, should be immediately arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal. Brissot had been arrested at Moulins. A decree forbidding domiciliary visits during the night was revoked.

Barère observed in his Report, that, according to the *grand mot* of the *Commune, terror* was to be the order of the day. "The Royalists desire blood; they shall have that of the conspirators, of Brissot and his faction, of Marie Antoinette. The Royalists wish to disturb the labours of the Convention; conspirators, it is your own that shall be disturbed! they want to destroy the Mountain —the Mountain will crush them!" In this memorable sitting of Sept. 5th, the Reign of Terror was thus distinctly and avowedly inaugurated. The Revolution from its commencement had indeed been a Reign of Terror, and particularly since the massacres of September; but now these atrocities were to be committed orderly and legally,[50] and the means of committing them were permanently organised.

To render despotism complete two things were still wanting: the *loi des suspects*, and the investing of the Government with uncontrolled power.

The *loi des suspects*, passed September 17th, defined suspected persons to be: 1, those who by their conduct, their relations, their conversation or their writings, had shown themselves partisans of tyranny or federalism and enemies of liberty; 2, those who could not prove their means of living, and the discharge of their civic duties; 3, those who had refused certificates of *civism*; 4, public functionaries deprived or suspended by the Convention; 5, *ci-devant* nobles, their husbands, wives, fathers, mothers, sons, daughters, also the agents of emigrants; 6, those who had emigrated between July 1st 1789 and the publication of the law of April 8th 1792, notwithstanding that they might have returned into France within the term fixed by that law.[51] Under the extensive and vague definitions of this dreadful law, not a man in France was safe. It was, moreover, to be wielded by Robespierre, who had told Garat: "I have no need to reflect. I am always guided by my *first impressions*!"[52] It was ordered that 50,000

[50] Barère observed: "Ce ne sont pas *des vengeances illégales*, ce sont *les tribunaux extraordinaires* qui vont opérer le mouvement." *Ibid.* p. 43. At the conclusion of his Report, Barère announced, amid great applause, that a nephew of Pitt's, concealed in the château du Cumériat, at Dinan, had been arrested. *Ibid.* p. 45.

[51] *Ibid.* p. 109; Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 87 sq. M. Blanc gives this law very imperfectly (t. ix. p. 240).

[52] *Mémoires* de Garat, in the *Hist. Parl.*, t. xviii. p. 334.

committees should be formed throughout France for the purpose of discovering enemies of the Revolution; and about half that number were actually established, composed of five members, each receiving five francs a day.

The new Constitution was suspended October 10th, on the motion of St. Just, and the Government declared *revolutionary*; a term which denoted the suspension of all custom and law, and signified sometimes the sovereign authority of the mob, in this case, the sovereign authority of the Government or Committee of Public Welfare. The Committee now had the surveillance of the Executive Council, the ministers, the generals, and all corporations—in short, a dictatorship.[53]

After the transference of Marie Antoinette to the Conciergerie, her fate could be no longer doubtful. She was suffered to languish two or three months in that dungeon, deprived almost of the common necessaries of life. Her clothes had fallen to rags, nor was she allowed the means of repairing them; a compassionate turnkey, who ventured to solicit for her a cotton coverlet, was menaced by Fouquier Tinville with the *guillotine*.[54] After her separation from her son, a shoemaker named Simon, a fellow of vulgar and brutal manners, had been appointed tutor to the young prince, whom he endeavoured to render as low and debased as himself. The Queen was brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal, October 14th, when Fouquier Tinville revived against her all the calumnies circulated in her earlier days by debauched and malignant courtiers, compared her to Messalina, Brunehaut, Fridegonda, Mary de' Medicis, accused her of corrupting the morals of her own son, a boy of eight! This last charge was repeated by the infamous Hébert, amplified, dwelt upon with details that make human nature shudder. Marie Antoinette was silent from horror and indignation: a juryman having insisted on an answer, she exclaimed: "If I have not replied, it is because nature revolts at such a charge against a mother. I appeal to every mother present."[55] This natural and noble answer excited a momentary feeling in her favour. Hébert, who thus brutally and cynically insulted the descendant of a long line of emperors, had been a check-taker at the Theâtre des Variétés, had been discharged for dishonesty, and had been convicted of robbing his furnished lodgings. Yet he was now a leading member of the *Commune*! The political charges against Marie Antoinette were, having sent

[53] See 2nd Art. of the Decree in *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 172.

[54] *Récit* de Madame Bault, ap. Blanc, t. ix. p. 387.

[55] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 399.

large sums of money to the Emperor, having favoured the Coalition, having exerted an undue influence over her husband, having endeavoured to excite a civil war, &c. Her condemnation was a matter of course. She was drawn to the place of execution in the common cart, and met her fate with unflinching fortitude (October 16th).

The murder of the Queen was soon followed by the execution of the Girondists. On the 24th of October twenty-one of that party, including Brissot, Vergniaud, and Gensonné, were arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal, and found guilty on the 30th of a conspiracy against the unity and indivisibility of the Republic, and the liberty and safety of the French people.[56] The real cause of their fate was their having opposed Robespierre and the Mountain, and endeavoured to *decentralise* the Revolution, that is, to resist the Paris mob by means of the Departments: but their own conduct, and especially their treatment of the King, deprives them of commiseration. When their trial had lasted three or four days, a Jacobin deputation having demanded of the Convention that juries should be empowered to put an end to a criminal prosecution whenever they considered themselves satisfied, Robespierre proposed and carried a law (October 29th) that the jury should be interrogated on this point after a trial had lasted three days. On the following morning this law was read to the Revolutionary Tribunal by the Public Accuser, and, after a short deliberation, a verdict of guilty was pronounced against all the prisoners, though not one of them had yet made his defence![57] The Girondists displayed an unseemly levity during their trial, and amused themselves in prison by a representation of it, in which they mocked and ridiculed the Public Accuser, the judges and the jury: symptoms rather of a want of reflection, or the hallucination of despair, than the firmness becoming men who called themselves patriots and statesmen. The body of Valazé, who stabbed himself on hearing his sentence, was carried to the place of execution with the rest.

The next victim of note was the Duke of Orléans, who had been kept in arrest at Marseilles since the spring, and had thence been transferred to the Conciergerie. He was condemned on the most inadequate evidence, but it is impossible to feel any pity for him. He met his fate with a hardened indifference, November 7th. Two days after, Madame Roland submitted her head to the fatal knife with undaunted courage. Her celebrated exclamation at the

[56] *Parl. Hist.* p. 450. [57] *Ibid.* t. xxx. p. 110.

scaffold, "O Liberty, what crimes are committed in thy name!" seems to show that she repented when too late of the atrocities she had herself contributed to instigate. Her husband, who had escaped into Normandy, on hearing of her death committed suicide on the high road near Rouen. Among other victims of this period may be mentioned Bailly, the astronomer and *ci-devant* mayor of Paris, the deputies Barnave, Kersaint and Rabaud St. Etienne, the generals Houchard, Brunet and Lamartière, and Madame du Barri, the mistress of Louis XV. Of the Girondists who had escaped into the provinces, Salles and Guadet were captured and executed in June 1794; Barbaroux shot himself near Castillon; Valady, arrested near Périgueux, was executed in that town in December 1793; the bodies of Pétion and Buzot were discovered half devoured by wolves. A few, as Louvet and Lanjuinais, succeeded in escaping.

In accordance with a maxim that all that is not new in revolutions is pernicious, was introduced a fantastic alteration of the calendar. As royalty had been abolished Sept. 21st 1792, it was resolved that the French era should begin from that event, as the commencement of the first year of the Republic. The year was to be composed of twelve months, each of thirty days, divided into decades, each tenth day being a day of repose instead of Sunday. The names of the days in each decade were *primidi, duodi, tridi, quartidi, quintidi, sextidi, septidi, octidi, nonidi, decadi.* The five supplementary days inserted at the end of the year and entitled *sansculotides*, formed a kind of festival, of which the first day was sacred to genius, the second to labour, the third to actions, the fourth to recompenses, the fifth to opinion. New names for the months adapted to their character, were suggested by Fabre d'Eglantine. The first month, which answered nearly to October, was called *Vendémiaire*, followed by *Brumaire, Frimaire, Nivose, Pluviose, Ventose, Germinal, Floréal, Prairial, Messidor, Thermidor, Fructidor.* The new calendar was decreed Oct. 24th 1793, and on the following day, in conformity with it, the *procès verbal* of the Convention was dated 4 *Brumaire an II. de la République Française.*

It would, however, be unjust to conceal that the Revolutionary Government employed themselves at this period in some useful schemes for the public good. The Polytechnic and Normal schools were prepared, the foundations of a civil code were laid, the *Grand Livre*, in which all the national creditors were inscribed, was opened, a uniformity of weights and measures was established, and the decimal system introduced. A certain quantity of

distilled water was taken as the unit for weights, a certain fraction of the meridian as the unit of measure, to be multiplied or divided *ad infinitum* by 10.[58]

There now remained little to alter or abolish except in the article of religion. Both Robespierre and the deists, and Hébert and the atheists, were resolved to set aside Christianity, but they were not exactly agreed as to what they should substitute in its place. The *Commune*, however, in which the atheists and materialists ruled supreme, took the lead. Chaumette, the *procureur-général*, a simpleton who fancied himself a philosopher, was one of the principal leaders in this crusade *against* Christianity, if such an expression may be allowed. He had adopted the motto inscribed by Fouché over the gate of the cemetery of Nevers, that "death is an eternal sleep," and had made several absurd and fantastic alterations in the rites of sepulture, among the rest, that the dead should be buried in a three-coloured flag. On the 10th of November he obtained a decree of the *Commune* for inaugurating the "worship of Reason" in the metropolitan cathedral of Nôtre Dame. Already, in the month of October, the churches had been desecrated, the images thrown down, the plate and other ornaments carried off, the sacristies broken open, the priests' vestments sold to brokers and old-clothes-men. Petitioners dressed in chasubles, and bearing golden crosses, mitres, and other insignia of the hierarchy, had appeared in grotesque masquerade, and with encouragement instead of reproof, at the bar of the Convention. In this confusion of everything sacred, Anacharsis Clootz and Chaumette, having persuaded Gobel, constitutional bishop of Paris, to renounce his episcopal office, brought him, accompanied by his twelve vicars, by Pache, the mayor, and other members of the Municipality, into the Convention; when, declaring that he had abdicated his functions, Gobel resigned his cross and ring; the vicars followed his example, and the President having embraced him, he and his priests put on the red cap, and traversed the Assembly amidst thunders of applause. Gobel's example was followed by a few other bishops and priests.

The Goddess of Reason, represented by an actress, was now installed at Nôtre Dame. In the nave was erected a sort of mountain, having a temple at the top, with the inscription, *À la Philosophie*. A prostitute, dressed as the Goddess of Liberty, came forth from the temple, seated herself on a sort of cloud, having at her feet a truncated column with a lamp called the

[58] L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.*, t. ix. p. 400.

flambeau de la vérité. Here she received the homage of a choir of girls dressed in white, whilst a hymn composed by Marie Joseph Chénier was chanted by all the *sans-culottes* present. The Goddess of Reason was now carried in procession to the Convention; Chaumette introduced her by a speech at the bar; the actress, descending from her throne, was embraced by the President, and took a seat by his side! By such absurd and blasphemous farces did these new republicans, the legislators of a great nation, delude and disgrace themselves.

These scenes were accompanied with a perfect carnival of atheism, folly, and debauchery. Prostitutes dressed as the Goddess of Reason were paraded in cars through the streets of Paris, accompanied by opera Herculeses, with pasteboard clubs, and followed by a rabble rout of drunken men and women. Members of the Convention might be seen dancing the *carmagnole* with girls of the town dressed in sacerdotal habits. The relics of St. Geneviève were publicly burnt in the Place de Grève, and a *procès-verbal* of the proceedings was despatched to the Pope. On Nov. 20th, the Section of l'Unité sent an enormous mass of church plate as an offering to the Convention. Their deputies were adorned with priestly vestments, copes and dalmatics, and carried a black flag, typifying the destruction of fanaticism. They sang the air *Marlboroug est mort et enterré,* and danced in the middle of the hall amid the applause of the Convention.[59] The churches were converted into public houses and brothels, the sculptures of Nôtre Dame were ordered to be destroyed, and wooden saints, missals, breviaries, and bibles were consumed in bonfires.[60] The county districts, however, refused to imitate the madness and profanities of the capital.

Robespierre disapproved of these proceedings. Although a man of blood, he was also a man of order; although a deist, he was, like his master Rousseau, for tolerating all religions, including that of the Roman Catholic Church. On Nov. 21st he denounced the atheists to the Jacobin Club as more dangerous enemies of the Revolution even than the priests and royalists, stigmatised their tenets as subversive of all political society. "Atheism," he said, "is aristocratic, while the idea of an Omnipotent Being watching over innocence and punishing triumphant crime is altogether popular."[61] He adopted the phrase of Voltaire, that if a God did not exist it would be necessary to invent one; and he concluded by moving that the Society should be purged of the traitors concealed

[59] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 269 sq.
[60] L. Blanc, t. ix. p. 482.
[61] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 277.

in its bosom, and the committees reorganised. These propositions were unanimously adopted. After this speech the indecent scenes which had disgraced Paris were no longer exhibited. One of the motives of Robespierre and the Committee of Public Welfare for suppressing them was the scandal which they created in foreign countries. Danton supported Robespierre, and Hébert and Chaumette found themselves compelled to make a sort of public recantation of their atheistical tenets.

While such was the state of Paris, the Revolutionary Government was gradually triumphing over its enemies in the provinces. The insurgents of La Vendée had been tolerably successful up to October, but their good fortune began then to desert them. After a succession of defeats at Chatillon-sur-Sèvre, La Tremblaye, and Chollet, in which Bonchamp was killed, at Granville, at Le Mans, they were finally beaten and dispersed at Savenay, Dec. 22nd, by the republican generals Westermann, Marceau, and Kléber. An English expedition under Lord Moira fitted out for their aid arrived too late. Henri de Larochejaquelein was killed in a skirmish in the following March by two republican grenadiers, whose lives he was endeavouring to save. In the south, Marseilles had opened its gates to Carteaux, August 25th. But this success decided the revolt of Toulon, a step which the inhabitants had been some months contemplating. Having opened communications with Admiral Hood, who was cruising off that port, the English fleet, accompanied by a Spanish and a Neapolitan squadron, entered the harbour August 27th, and took possession of the place, after a short resistance from a few of the French vessels. On the following day Admiral Hood published a Declaration that he took possession of Toulon in the name of Louis XVII. Two English regiments from Gibraltar, under General O'Hara, and between 12,000 and 13,000 Spanish, Piedmontese, and Neapolitan troops, were subsequently introduced into the town,[62] and the forts around it were occupied. Lyon had been besieged by Kellermann since August 8th. The operations were really conducted by Dubois Crancé, but little progress was made till the end of the month, when the besieging force was largely increased and 100 guns brought into play. The hopes of the inhabitants rested on a diversion to be made by a Piedmontese corps, which, however, was

[62] The real numbers of the garrison were 6,521 Spaniards, 2,421 Englishmen, 4,334 Neapolitans, 1,584 Piedmontese, 1,542 National Guards of Toulon—altogether, more than 16,000 men. See Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. i. S. 488 ff. Where will be found new and more correct particulars respecting the occupation of Toulon by the allies, from the account given by an eye-witness to the King of Prussia.

defeated by Kellermann; and Lyon, after sustaining a terrible bombardment, and being reduced to the extremity of famine, was compelled to surrender, Oct. 9th. On the 12th the Convention decreed that the portion of the town inhabited by the rich should be demolished, that its name should be effaced from the towns of the Republic; that what remained of it should henceforth be called *Commune Affranchie*; and, in the mock sublime of that epoch, it was ordained that a column should be erected on the ruins with the inscription, "Lyon made war upon liberty: Lyon exists no more."[63]

The reduction of Lyon was soon followed by that of Toulon. The force of the allies was weakened by those dissensions which attended all the operations of the Coalition. The inhabitants of Toulon were divided into the two parties of Constitutionalists and Royalists. As the former were the more numerous and possessed all the municipal offices, the English consulted their views. The Spaniards, on the other hand, adopted all the more warmly the minority, whose religious and political principles coincided with their own. This party demanded the recall of the clergy, and that the Count of Provence should be summoned to Toulon as Regent of France; but as these measures were opposed by the Constitutionalists, they were declined by Admiral Hood. The Spaniards then demanded that the Toulon fleet should be delivered to their sovereign as a member of the House of Bourbon, although by the capitulation of the town it had been expressly given into English keeping, and the demand was therefore refused.[64] These bickerings, as we shall have to relate further on, laid the foundation of a rupture between Spain and England. The English Government, in conformity with its principle of not prescribing any particular form of government to the French, had even disapproved of Admiral Hood's act in taking possession of Toulon in the name of Louis XVII. The most sinister imputations have been thrown on this policy by French writers of all parties.[65] But the English Cabinet was of opinion that a single town, however respectable, could not decide so momentous a question, nor England determine it without appealing to all the allied courts.[66] Such a decision, indeed, might have proved a serious embarrassment in any negociations for peace. The siege of Toulon was first undertaken by Carteaux, a *ci-devant* painter. He was accompanied by the deputy Salicetti, a Corsican, who retained at Toulon his countryman, Napoleon Bonaparte, then a young captain of artillery, whose

[63] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxix. p. 192; Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 96 sqq.

[64] Von Sybel, *loc. cit.*

[65] See Montgaillard, *Hist. de France*, t. iv. p. 168; L. Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.*, t. x. p. 89.

[66] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 419.

small and at that time meagre figure and pallid face were redeemed by his piercing eye and intelligent appearance. The siege made little progress till after the reduction of Lyon; the troops from which place, together with large draughts from the army of Italy, raised the besieging army to more than 60,000 men.[67] The command of this force was now given to Dugommier, an experienced general; but the Convention appointed five commissaries to watch over him, namely, Barras, Fréron, Salicetti, Augustine Robespierre (Maximilian's younger brother), and Ricord, with instructions that Toulon *must* be taken, pointing clearly to the alternative of the *guillotine*. This magic word, combined with the overwhelming force of the assailants and the military skill of Bonaparte, performed wonders. After the reduction of some of the surrounding forts by the republicans, General O'Hara, the commander-in-chief, who, with Lord Hood and Sir Gilbert Elliot, formed a directorial commission, found himself compelled to evacuate Toulon, Dec. 19th; but not before the arsenal and a large part of the French fleet had been burnt, under the conduct of Commodore Sir Sidney Smith. Three ships of the line and twelve frigates were carried off by the English. About 12,000 Toulonese were put on board the allied fleets,[68] and thus escaped the vengeance of their countrymen; but numbers were necessarily left behind.

The republican Government signalised its triumphs by a series of the most horrible massacres, executed by its commissaries or proconsuls. At Bordeaux, which had embraced the Girondist cause but for a moment, Tallien and his colleague Ysabeau caused 108 persons to be guillotined. Here these two proconsuls lived in state with a guard at their door, and, while the town was almost in a state of famine, required to be served with the finest wines, the most exquisite delicacies. Tallien acquired a fortune by his peculations.[69] These atrocities were more than rivalled by Fréron and Barras at Marseilles, and Collot d'Herbois and Fouché at Lyon. At Marseilles was established a Commission of Six, divided for the sake of expedition into two courts, without public accuser or jury. The persons accused, having been asked their names, professions, and fortunes, were sent down to the executioner's cart, which was always standing before the Palais de Justice, and the judges appearing on the balcony pronounced sentence of death. The head of this horrible tribunal, a young man of twenty, con-

[67] Von Sybel, from the French archives, B. ii. S. 491.

[68] Von Sybel, B. i. S. 492.

[69] Prudhomme, *Hist. Générale, &c.*

demned 160 persons in ten days.[70] Fréron, in pursuance of his idea "that every rebel city should disappear from the face of the earth," mutilated most of the public buildings and monuments of Marseilles, and called it "the nameless town." He and Barras appropriated 800,000 francs, which they ought to have paid into the treasury, as the spoils of this city, on pretence that their carriage had been overturned in a ditch.[71] At Toulon, a jury of twelve patriots picked out about 150 royalists for execution, who were mowed down by a battery of cannon charged with case-shot. At Lyon Couthon at first seemed inclined to show some mercy; but he was superseded towards the end of October by Collot d'Herbois and Fouché, who caused men, women, and children, rich and poor, to be shot down in masses with artillery; those who escaped the shot were hacked to pieces by the soldiery.[72] The number of victims is stated at 410, but the accounts vary.[73] About forty houses were demolished by artillery and a great many more damaged; but to raze Lyon to the ground was found to be too vast an undertaking.

But all these atrocities were outdone by the infamous Carrier at Nantes. The first act of this monster on arriving at Nantes, October 8th, when the Vendéan war was still going on, was to form the *Compagnie de Marat*, to make domiciliary visits and arrest suspected persons, of whom 600 were thrown into prison. Carrier was intoxicated with blood. He threatened to throw half the town of L'Orient into the sea, and ordered General Haxo to exterminate all the inhabitants of La Vendée and burn their dwellings.[74] The *noyades* or drownings commenced towards the end of *Brumaire*. Priests sentenced to transportation were placed in a vessel with a sort of trap-door, which proceeded down the Loire, and, the bolts being withdrawn, the unhappy victims were drowned. Carrier facetiously called this *vertical* deportation. Young men and women, bound together, were thrown into the river, a mode of execution pleasantly styled "the republican marriage." Hundreds of infants were also drowned. This was called "republican baptism." The water of the Loire was infected to such an extent by the multitude of corpses, that the police forbade the citizens of Nantes to drink it, or to eat the fish caught in it. The lowest estimate of the victims of Carrier's blood-thirstiness during the four months of his operations at

[70] L. Blanc, t. x. p. 158.

[71] Barère, *Mémoires*, t. iv. p. 13.

[72] M. Blanc appears to think that Lyon required a little *bleeding*: "Il convient de dire, pour être juste envers tous, que le mal à Lyon semblait appeler l'emploi de *remèdes énergiques*," t. x. p. 164.

[73] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. pp. 397, 399.

[74] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. p. 173, 218.

Nantes amounts to 15,000.[75] Carrier is said to have used his power to force the chastity of women, and to have put to death husbands who would not consent to their dishonour.

We must now return to the campaign. After the fall of Valenciennes, a rapid march on Paris would probably have proved successful. The immense northern frontier of France was defended only by a few isolated camps, the interior was in combustion, while the allies had nearly 300,000 men between Basle and Ostend. But their conduct was guided first by their own selfish and separate interests, and next by the ancient routine maxims of strategy, which required the reduction of the frontier fortresses. Prince Coburg therefore resolved to reduce Quesnoy, and the Duke of York had instructions from London to lay siege to Dunkirk. From Paris as a centre, Carnot[76] directed all the operations of the French armies on the vast circumference threatened. The Duke of York sat down before Dunkirk towards the end of August 1793. His total force, including 12,000 Austrians under Alvinzi, amounted to about 36,000 men. These were divided into two corps, one of siege, the other of observation; the first being commanded by himself, while the other, under marshal Freitag, was posted at Hondschoote. Houchard had succeeded Kilmaine in the command of the French army of the North. He was popular with the soldiery, and reckoned a good democrat; but the fate of Custine rendered him somewhat solicitous about his own. This feeling was increased by a visit from the terrible Billaud Varennes, who caused twenty-two adjutants-general to be arrested in one night![77] Next morning Houchard found himself without a staff. By orders from Paris, Houchard attacked Freitag at Hondschoote, September 8th, and completely defeated him. Freitag was slain in the engagement, but Walmoden, who succeeded him, effected a retreat to Furnes. The Duke of York was now in a perilous situation. He was encamped in a sort of peninsula; instead of an English fleet, which he had expected, a French squadron had arrived and molested his right flank; if the victorious enemy advanced, he must either lay down his arms or be driven into the sea; he was therefore compelled to raise the siege precipitately, abandoning fifty-two guns and his baggage. It was generally thought, even in England, that had Houchard pushed on, the Duke and his whole army must have

[75] Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. ii. S. 499.

[76] Carnot's military genius devised that new system of warfare which, by rapidly concentrating a superior force on a given point, effected such wonders in the hands of Napoleon.

[77] Blanc, t. ix. p. 288.

been captured.[78] Houchard, however, suffered him to form a junction with Walmoden at Furnes, where they presented too strong a front to be attacked. Houchard contented himself with dispersing an isolated Dutch force at Menin, September 13th. Advancing thence, two days after, to meet the Austrian general Beaulieu, his troops were seized with one of those unaccountable panics so frequent in the wars of the Revolution, and which it was the fashion to ascribe to treachery. Cries having arisen of "We are betrayed! *Sauve qui peut!*" the French fled in disorder to Lille. For this misfortune, and for not having attacked the Duke of York, Houchard was deprived of his command and subsequently guillotined. He was succeeded by Jourdan.

Le Quesnoy surrendered to the Austrians Sept. 9th, after a siege of fourteen days. Prince Coburg now determined to close the campaign by the reduction of Maubeuge and Landrecies, which would render him master of the valley of the Sambre, and to march on Paris the following year. But Jourdan, acting under the directions of Carnot, who was present, saved Maubeuge by defeating the Austrians at WATTIGNIES, a neighbouring height, after a bloody battle which lasted two days (Oct. 16th). General Ferrant, commandant of Maubeuge, who had neglected to assist the army of liberation, was arraigned before the Revolutionary Tribunal and executed. But the victory of Wattignies was followed by no results. General Davesnes having failed through sheer incapacity in an attempt to invade maritime Flanders, expiated with his head his want of success; and Jourdan himself was deprived of the command for not passing the Sambre after his victory. The retreat of the Austrians was unmolested, and they soon after took up their winter quarters in the environs of Le Quesnoy, Valenciennes, and Condé. The Duke of York did the same at Tournay, covering Flanders, while the French established themselves at Guise.

Towards the Rhine, the Prussians after the capture of Mentz had remained almost entirely inactive, notwithstanding the pressing invitations of Wurmser, the Austrian general in Alsace, to join him in vigorous operations. The views of the Prussians were fixed on Poland, and the French campaign was little more than a blind to their projects in that quarter. A temporary disappointment there, coupled with some discussions with Austria, induced Frederick William suddenly to abandon his allies. It is impossible for us to detail the sinuous policy of the two German states at this period. It will suffice to state that Austria had wished

[78] *Ann. Register*, 1793, p. 192.

to reap the Bavarian succession after the death of the Elector Charles Theodore, who had no legitimate children; but had been induced to relinquish the project through the repugnance to it of the Bavarians themselves, the opposition of the next heirs, the princes of Zweybrücken, as well as of Prussia, the representations of England, and lastly also, the unwillingness of Charles Theodore himself to consent. Although Austria had abandoned this claim, yet as her relinquishment of it was unknown to Prussia, she brought it forward in some negociations which took place at the King of Prussia's headquarters towards the end of August, with the view of merely covering some demands for a share of Poland, and making a merit of relinquishing Bavaria. The discovery of this duplicity excited the King of Prussia's indignation, which was increased by the knowledge that Austria intended seizing Alsace for herself. Frederick William's ill humour was further increased by news from Poland to the purport that the negociations for securing his share of that country were going on anything but favourably. He now recollected that he had promised his aid in the French war solely for the campaign of 1793, and that only on condition of acquisitions in Poland; and about the middle of September he announced to the Austrians his intention of quitting the Coalition.[79] In this step he completely disregarded the treaty which he had entered into with England only two months before for the better prosecution of the war with France. Towards the end of September, Frederick William II. withdrew from his army, alleging the necessity of joining his troops assembling on the frontiers of Poland.[80] Thus was the first blow struck at the Coalition.

The French had made two ineffectual attempts to pass the Rhine; they had also been repulsed with great loss in an attack upon the Duke of Brunswick's position at Pirmasens, Sept. 14th; but neither this success, nor the remonstrances of the British ambassador, could stimulate the Duke to action. At length he was induced to join Wurmser in an attack upon the French lines between Weissemburg and Lauterburg October 13th; when the French, defeated at every point, were compelled to evacuate those two places, and to make a hasty retreat towards the Geisberg. Wurmser entered Haguenau October 17th; but he also displayed some remissness, and allowed the French to escape to Strasburg. This town would probably have opened its gates to the Austrians

[79] For these affairs see Von Sybel, Buch vii. Kap. 6.

[80] For his affairs with that country see next chapter.

if Wurmser would have assured the inhabitants that possession of it should be taken in the name of Louis XVII.; but such an arrangement was contrary to the policy of the Austrian Cabinet, which aimed at the recovery of Alsace. But the plot was discovered. St. Just, accompanied by Lebas, arrived at Strasburg October 22nd, as Commissaries or Proconsuls of the Convention. St. Just immediately began to display his power. The day after his arrival, he degraded the commandant Lacour to the ranks for having struck a soldier in a moment of excitement. On the 24th he proclaimed that "if there are in the army any traitors, or even any men indifferent to the people's cause, we bring with us the sword to strike them!"[81] He erected the military tribunal attached to the army of the Rhine into a special and *Revolutionary* Commission; and he ordered General Eisenberg and a number of officers who had been surprised by the enemy and fled, to be shot in the redoubt of Hähnheim. Thus the Reign of Terror prevailed even in the camp. St. Just, who has been characterised as having a head of fire with a heart of ice, was its fitting instrument.[82] The citizens of Strasburg were treated like the soldiery. The property of the rich, even their beds and apparel, was confiscated for the use of the army. A forced loan of nine millions (360,000*l.*), payable in twenty-four hours, was exacted from a certain list of persons. One of them not having been able to raise his *quota* in the given time, was exposed three hours on the scaffold of the *guillotine*; another, an hotel-keeper, who had been assessed at 40,000 francs, presented the keys of his house to St. Just, and requested him to discharge his debts.[83]

Wurmser had engaged in the siege of Landau, in which he expected the co-operation of the Prussians. But the Duke of Brunswick having failed in an attempt upon the castle of Bitche, in the Vosges, took occasion to effect a retreat, which he had long contemplated, and retired to Kaiserslautern. He was followed by the French under Hoche, who, however, after some bloody engagements (28th, 29th, and 30th of December), were forced to retreat. The Duke of Brunswick's movements having exposed the Austrian right, Hoche despatched a division of 12,000 men through the Vosges to take them in flank, while Pichegru attacked them in front. Hoche himself assailed and dispersed without a blow the Palatine and Bavarian troops at Werdt, Dec. 22nd 1793. Wurmser was now compelled to retreat in disorder to the Geisberg; the armies of the Rhine and Moselle formed a junction, while the

[81] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxi. p. 37. [82] Barère, *Mém.* t. ii. p. 235. [83] Blanc, t. x. p. 129.

retrograde movement of the Austrians had also united them with the Prussians. But the Austrians being attacked and defeated by the French at the Geisberg, Dec. 26th, Wurmser, disgusted with the conduct of the Prussians, resolved to abandon them, and crossed the Rhine between Philippsburg and Manheim, Dec. 30th; when the Prussians fell back towards Mentz.[84] Thus, as the result of the campaign in this quarter, the French re-occupied the lines of Weissemburg, raised the blockade of Landau, recovered Alsace, and took up their winter quarters in the Palatinate.

On the Spanish frontier, where the French were not able to employ any adequate force, the campaign of 1793 left the Spaniards in possession of St. Elmo, Collioure and Port Vendre, on the eastern side of the Pyrenees. On the western, nothing important was done, and the Spaniards maintained their positions. On the side of Piedmont, Masséna succeeded in holding the Austro-Sardinian army in check. The French arms were for the most part unsuccessful in the colonies. In the East Indies, Chandernagore, Pondicherry, and one or two smaller settlements fell into the hands of the English, who also captured in the West Indies Tobago, St. Pierre, and Miquelon, but failed in attempts upon Martinico and St. Domingo. In the last-named island, the negroes had risen against their masters; the commissaries Santhonax and Polverel, despatched thither by the Republican Government with unlimited powers, sided with the insurgents, admitted the coloured population to a sudden and complete participation in all political rights, and rendered the colony one vast scene of desolation.[85]

As the Revolution proceeded parties continued to separate. The *Gironde* had supplanted the Constitutionalists, and had in its turn been overthrown by the *Montagne*. The Revolution, it has been said, like Saturn, devoured its own children. In the democratic residuum still left we find three distinct factions. First, the ultra-democrats, called *Hébertistes* and *Enragés*, who were for terror in all its wildest excesses, for atheism in its most absurd and blasphemous forms. In contradistinction to this faction had sprung up what was called *le parti de la clémence*, or party of mercy, at the head of which was Camille Desmoulins, and, strange to say, Danton also seemed to incline to it. Danton was not *incorruptible*, like Robespierre, but he had more of human nature in his composition. He had made a comfortable fortune by his patriotism, had married a young wife, and was inclined to enjoy the position he had achieved. Between these two parties stood

[84] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 431 sqq. [85] Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 45.

that of Robespierre, St. Just, and Couthon, who desired a sort of political and regulated terror, which they disguised under the sacred name of justice.[86] Being now members of the Government, they had become more conservative without being a whit less cruel; and they were indignant at seeing the direction of the populace, by means of which they had themselves risen, taken out of their hands by men like Hébert and his companions. As the year 1793 drew to a close it became evident that a deadly struggle between these parties was at hand.

Robespierre at first showed symptoms of adhesion to the "party of mercy." Camille Desmoulins, who had been his schoolfellow, had started a journal called the *Vieux Cordelier*, in which he advocated the principles of the old Cordelier Club, which was now governed by Hébert's party. Robespierre had saved Danton as well as Desmoulins from being expelled the Jacobins; had patronised the *Vieux Cordelier*, had even revised the first two numbers. But the brilliant and fickle author soon overstepped the bounds of discretion. In his third number, he not obscurely likened the atrocities of the Reign of Terror to some of the worst passages in the history of the Roman Emperors; and, under pretence of denying, betrayed his real design by protesting beforehand against any comparison which malignity might draw between the present times and those whose pictures he had borrowed from Tacitus. In his fourth number he went still further. He demanded a *Committee of Clemency*, the flinging open of the prisons, and the liberation of 200,000 *suspects*. Unluckily on that very day Robespierre had proposed in the Convention a *Committee of Justice*, the new name for Terror;[87] which, however, was not adopted.

It is probable that Robespierre had patronised for a while the Party of Clemency only that he might the more securely overwhelm that of the *Hébertistes*. The contest was initiated by the Cordelier Club, then, as we have said, under the influence of

[86] The Terrorists had begun to discover that their favourite method would not accomplish everything. Thus, St. Just observes in his *Institutions*: 'La *terreur* peut nous débarrasser de la monarchie et de l'aristocratie; mais qui nous délivrera de la *corruption?*"—And again: "L'exercice de la *terreur* a blasé le crime, comme les liqueurs fortes blasent le palais." See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxv. p. 284, 290. Mingled with some sensible remarks, the *Institutions* of St. Just present the most monstrous specimens of fanaticism and absurdity. Among other regulations, he was for making every proprietor rear four sheep annually for every acre he possessed (*Hist. Parl.* t. xxxv. p. 340). France would have been devoured by its own flocks!

[87] M. Blanc, a partisan of Robespierre *quand même*, thinks that the views of the party of clemency were altogether unseasonable and absurd—that they demanded for the *régime* of liberty *militant*, what was only suitable for that of liberty *victorious*. *Hist. de la Rév. Fr.* t. x. p. 230. Cf. p. 206. It was right, therefore, that the executions should go on.

Hébert, by sending several insolent deputations to the Convention. Robespierre, by defending Camille Desmoulins, seemed to have incurred the dangerous charge of *modérantisme*. He explained and defended his views in his *Report on the principles of the Revolutionary Government*, presented to the Convention in the name of the Committee of Public Welfare, December 25th 1793.[88] He there described the course of the Government as lying between two extremes, weakness and *modérantisme* on the one hand, rashness and excess on the other; and he evidently hinted at the denunciation of Hébert and Baron Clootz.[89] And to show that the charge of *modérantisme*, or clemency, was an unjust imputation, he concluded by proposing a decree for accelerating the judgment of foreigners and generals charged with crimes like those of Dumouriez, Custine, Lamarlière, and Houchard.

The *Hébertistes* determined on trying their strength by an insurrection. They took occasion of the distress produced by the severe winter to spread pamphlets, attributing to the Convention all the miseries of Paris; but they failed in their attempt to excite the *Commune*, and consequently to raise the mob. The proletarians now looked up exclusively to the Committee of Public Welfare; among the citizens of a better class there was but one voice of scorn and horror for Hébert and his companions; while at the decisive moment, Henriot, the military leader of the *Commune*, went over to Robespierre.[90] On the night of March 13th 1794, after a speech by St. Just in the Convention, Hébert and the leaders of his party, Chaumette, Vincent, Clootz, Momoro and others, were arrested. Their trial, which lasted three days, was, like the rest of that epoch, a mere parody of justice; but though the charges brought against them were futile, most of them richly deserved their fate. They were executed March 24th to the number of nineteen. Hébert died like a coward. Their execution was followed by considerable changes. The *Commune* was reconstructed; Pache the Mayor was replaced by Lescot Fleuriot. The Cordelier Club was broken up.

The Dantonists were the next victims. Danton had been troublesome by demanding an examination of the conduct of public functionaries, and that the Committees should give an account of their acts. As if a Government that had declared itself *revolutionary*, that is, irresponsible, was to be questioned! Camille

[88] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxx. p. 468 sqq.

[89] "L'ami des rois et le procureur général du genre humain s'entendent assez bien. Le fanatique couvert de scapulaires et le *fanatique qui prêche l'athéisme* ont entre eux beaucoup de rapports. Les *barons démocrates* sont les frères des marquis de Coblenz." *Ibid.* p. 461.

[90] Levasseur, *Mém.*, t. iii. p. 40.

Desmoulins was included in the proscription. It is probable that he owed his fate to the spite of St. Just. He had said of that demagogue, who wore a very stiff cravat, "that he carried his head with respect, like the holy sacrament;" on which St. Just is said to have observed: "And I will make him carry his like a St. Denis." On the night of March 30th, Danton, Desmoulins, Philippeaux, and Lacroix were arrested, after a deliberation of the two committees united. Legendre next day demanded that they should be tried at the bar of the Convention. Robespierre opposed this in a speech in which he described Danton as "a pretended idol long since rotten;" when Legendre stuttered out some cowardly excuses. St. Just gave them the *coup de grâce* in an harangue in which he had the effrontery to say that he denounced them as the last partisans of royalty! Chabot, Bazire, Fabre d'Eglantine, Delaunay, Julien (of Toulouse) were also prisoners at the Luxembourg at this time on a charge of forgery, and they were tried with the Dantonists April 2nd; also Hérault de Séchelles and Westermann. Danton bellowed out his defence so that his voice was audible on the other side of the Seine. But it was to no purpose; the prisoners were of course foredoomed. The trial was stopped on the fourth day, and the jury brought in a verdict of guilty, though not a fourth part of the prisoners had been heard in their defence. From their violence, and the symptoms displayed by the audience, the Court was afraid to pass sentence on the accused at the bar; it was read to them by their jailer. They were guillotined April 5th. Camille Desmoulins, almost in a state of madness, tore his clothes to pieces in the cart, and was almost naked when he arrived at the scaffold. He cried to the people that they were deceived; but Danton told him to be quiet and leave that vile *canaille* alone. Danton, during his imprisonment, had said of the Committee of Public Welfare that they were all Cain's brethren—that Brissot would have *guillotined* him as Robespierre had done. "What proves Robespierre a Nero," he remarked, "was, that he had never spoken to Camille Desmoulins with so much friendship as on the eve of his arrest."[91]

By the defeat of the two factions of Dantonists and Hébertistes, the Committee of Public Welfare seemed to have acquired irresistible power. The submission to it was general and absolute. To show that the Government could not be charged with *modérantisme*, the executions kept their usual course. Good and bad were involved in a like fate. Among the victims of this period may be mentioned Dépresmenil, Le Chapelier, the venerable

[91] L. Blanc, t. x. p. 369.

Malesherbes, Lavoisier the chemist, General Dillon, Chaumette, Gobel, the apostate bishop. The execution of numbers of women outdoes the other brutalities of the Reign of Terror. The wives of Danton and Camille Desmoulins, the Princess Elizabeth, the meek and saint-like sister of Louis XVI., were sent to the scaffold. Robespierre is said to have told Maret, the bookseller, that he had wished to save Madame Elizabeth, but that Collot d'Herbois prevented it.[92] The latter, who had been an unsuccessful actor and indifferent writer, was the only one of Hébert's faction who had obtained a seat in the Committee of Public Welfare.

Robespierre, having triumphed over the atheists, proceeded to establish the existence of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul by a decree of the Convention! (18th *Floréal*—May 7th 1794). It was not, however, the God of the Scriptures, but the God of Reason, substituted for the Goddess of Reason. A fête, planned by David the painter, was got up in honour of this new Deity, intended to outrival that of the Hébertistes (June 8th). An amphitheatre was erected in the gardens of the Tuileries, with seats for the members of the Convention, whilst over the basin was erected a group of monsters representing Atheism, Egotism, Discord, and Ambition. Robespierre had been named President of the Assembly for the occasion, and dressed himself in a sky-blue coat. After a speech to the members he proceeded to set fire to the monsters, when, after their destruction, the figure of Wisdom was to appear in the midst; unfortunately, however, the flames caught its veil, and the statue appeared in a very blackened condition! Hence the members of the Convention walked in procession to the Champ de Mars, dressed in the uniform of representatives *en mission*, with feathers in their hats and a three-coloured sash. In the midst of them was an antique car, drawn by eight oxen with gilt horns, and carrying a trophy composed of instruments of art. Robespierre, as President, marched at the head of the deputies; his colleagues in the Committees, it is said, kept as far behind him as they could, in order to make his position appear the more invidious; for they had already resolved on his destruction.[93] In the centre of the Champ de Mars rose a symbolical mountain, on which the deputies took their seats, and a hymn to the Supreme Being was sung, composed by the same Marie Joseph Chenier[94] whose facile muse had a little while before celebrated the triumph of atheism.

[92] Beaulieu, *Essais histor. sur la Révol.*, t. vi. p. 10 note.

[93] Blanc, *Hist. de la Rév. Fr.*, t. x. p. 468.

[94] André Chénier, his brother, also a poet, and a much better one, was guillotined July 25th.

The spectacle, we are told, was one of inconceivable grandeur, and we may readily believe that there was considerable scenic effect. It was the triumph of Robespierre. His customary morosity seemed to have vanished: never had he been observed so radiant. But there were not wanting those who, like the slave in the Roman triumph, audibly whispered some discomforting doubts. "Is he not the chief priest? See, it is not enough to be master, he must be a god as well! There may, however, still be a Brutus!" Among the foremost to insult him were Bourdon de l'Oise and Merlin de Thionville. Robespierre, so exulting in the morning, returned to his lodgings at Duplay's alarmed and dejected.[95]

St. Just had also given offence by his haughtiness; he had had a violent quarrel with Carnot, and a complete schism had taken place in the Committee of Public Welfare. Robespierre, St. Just, and Couthon now stood alone. The treatment he had met with at the fête determined Robespierre to strike the terrorists of the Committee of General Safety, Amar, Jagot, Vadier, Vouland, and the Commissaries of the Convention who had rendered themselves notorious by their cruelties, such as Fouché, Fréron, Tallien, Carrier. With this view he introduced the terrible law called the "Law of 22nd *Prairial*" (June 10th), intended to accelerate the trial of conspirators. By this law the Revolutionary Tribunal was again re-formed. It was now to consist of a president, three vice-presidents, a public accuser, and four substitutes, twelve judges and fifty jurymen; and for practice it was to be divided into sections of twelve members, each section having not fewer than seven jurors. Its object was said to be to punish the enemies of the people; in which category were included those who had sought to create dearth, to inspire discouragement, to spread false news, to mislead public opinion, to corrupt the public conscience, to alter the energy and purity of revolutionary and republican principles, &c. &c. In short, it was a net to catch all fish. The accused were not to be allowed counsel; it was not necessary to call witnesses; the decision was left to "the conscience of jurymen enlightened by the love of their country." There was no appeal, and the sole punishment was death! By Article 20, all previous laws relating to the Tribunal were to be abrogated. This would have done away with the law which forbade any member of the Convention to be brought before the Tribunal, unless a decree of accusation had been previously obtained against him; and thus the Convention would have been placed at the mercy of Robespierre

[95] Esquiros, *Hist. des Montagnards*, ap. Blanc, t. x. p. 459.

and his two colleagues; since the signatures of three members of the Committee of Public Welfare sufficed to send a man to trial. But the Convention took the alarm, and though Robespierre and Couthon succeeded in carrying the article, it was not till after a long and warm discussion which served to expose their motives.[96]

This law had been obtained by Robespierre and Couthon. St. Just was absent on a mission without consulting the rest of the Committee, by whom next day they were called to a severe account. A violent scene ensued. Robespierre was so loud that it was necessary to shut the windows, in order that he might not be heard by the people on the terrace of the Tuileries. Billaud Varennes charged him with wishing to guillotine the members of the Convention; Robespierre retorted by accusing Billaud of revolutionary projects. Other stormy scenes took place in the Convention. Bourdon and Tallien were so alarmed by Robespierre's threats that the former took to his bed for a month, while the latter wrote him a humble letter of submission.[97]

After this period Robespierre ceased to attend the Committee. This was a mistake, as it enabled his adversaries all the better to combine against him. What was his motive? A real disgust of the system of terror? Such a supposition seems improbable. By the law of 22nd *Prairial* he had increased the means of terror. It was evidently a political move, though a mistaken one. As he had overcome the *Hébertistes* or *Enragés* by means of the *indulgens*, and the *indulgens* by the cry for "justice," so now he wanted to overthrow his opponents in the Committees by reconciling himself with the moderate party and the remnant of the Girondists.

In a speech at the Jacobins, 13th *Messidor* (July 1st), he denounced the system of terror, at the same time proclaiming unceasing war against all counter-revolutionists. In another address at the same place, 23rd *Messidor*, he pursued the same subject, and demanded that Fouché should be brought to account for his atrocities at Lyon.[98] In an artful passage of the former speech, he complained that the calumnies forged against him in London were repeated by his enemies in Paris; thus insinuating that all who said anything to his prejudice were implicated in the great foreign conspiracy recently invented and denounced.

The story of this conspiracy had been got up on occasion of an attempt to assassinate Collot d'Herbois by a man named Admiral, and was subsequently applied to a suspected design of a young

[96] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii. p. 193 sqq. Cf. t. xxxvi. p. 5.

[97] *Ibid.* pp. 214, 224; Le Cointre, ap. Blanc, t. x. p. 490.

[98] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii. pp. 323, 342.

woman named Cécile Rénault on the life of Robespierre. No satisfactory evidence was produced against Cécile; she had, however, avowed that she preferred a king to 50,000 tyrants, and that she had gone to Robespierre's house to see what a tyrant was like.[99] The Committee of General Safety contrived to involve fifty-two other persons of all ranks, ages, and sexes in this pretended conspiracy. It is said that Robespierre had nothing to do with their trial, that it was, in fact, got up by his enemies to place him in an invidious light; that in order to forward this object, Fouquier Tinville, at the suggestion of a member of the Committee, ordered fifty-four red shirts, the costume of parricides, to be prepared for the condemned persons. The procession of the victims (June 17th 1794) was all the more striking, as the *guillotine* had now been removed to the Barrière du Trône, and the carts had consequently to pass through the faubourg St. Antoine. This affair of the *Chemises Rouges*, as it was called, was soon followed by that of a pretended conspiracy in the prisons. The Committee of Public Welfare authorised Hermann, a commissary of civil administration, to investigate plots in prisons, by an *arrêté*, dated 7th *Messidor* an II. (June 25th 1794), and signed by Robespierre, Billaud Varennes, and Barère.[100] Robespierre, therefore, appears to have retained the power of signing decrees, though he had now absented himself from the Committee; but we are not aware that any later signature can be produced. An *arrêté* for the execution of some prisoners, though signed by St. Just, 2nd *Thermidor* (July 20th), bears neither the name of Robespierre nor of Couthon.[101] One of the substitutes of the public accuser charged Hermann with proposing to the Committee "to sweep out the prisons in order to depopulate France and make Robespierre dictator."[102] A list was made out of 159 persons confined in the Luxembourg, including the prince d'Hénin, the Duke de Gêvres, thirty-nine nobles, the ex-prior of the Chartreux, several general and other officers, bankers, &c. They were nearly all condemned and executed 19th, 21st, 22nd *Messidor* (July 7th, 9th, 10th). These executions were followed by that of several prisoners in the *Carmes*.

It is impossible to ascertain Robespierre's share in these atrocities after his withdrawal from the Committee. It is, however, certain that after that event the number of executions vastly increased. In the forty-five days which elapsed from the assumed date of his retirement (June 11th) till his overthrow on the 9th

[99] *Hist. Parl.* p. 103.
[100] *Ibid.* t. xxxv. p. 43.
[101] L. Blanc, t. xi. p. 110.
[102] *Hist. Parl., loc. cit.*

Thermidor (July 27th), 1285 persons were guillotined, while during the forty-five days immediately preceding only 577 persons had suffered.[103] It was after his retirement that people were sent to the *guillotine* in what were called *fournées* or batches, by which speedy method one person was often executed in mistake for another. We must recollect, however, that Robespierre had at least facilitated this wholesale butchery by his law of 22nd *Prairial*.

The Committees endeavoured to persuade the Convention that they were all embarked in a common cause; that a massacre of the deputies was intended, and they tried to convince each individually of his personal danger. Robespierre and Couthon, on the other hand, in their speeches at the Jacobins, professed the greatest respect for the Convention, asserted that their eyes were fixed only on five or six of its members—"five or six little human creatures, whose hands are full of the wealth of the Republic, and at the same time dripping with the blood of the innocent persons whom they have sacrificed."[104] Every means were used to show Robespierre in an invidious light as a would-be dictator and a patron of superstition and priestcraft. With the last view, a false and ridiculous story was invented of his being a disciple of one Catherine Theot, a crazy old woman, who, like Joanna Southcote in England, gave out that she was the mother of God. With respect to the other charge, St. Just, it is said, actually proposed in a meeting of the two Committees (July 23rd) that Robespierre should be named dictator. The anecdote is recorded and believed by the republican editors of the *Histoire Parlementaire*,[105] on the authority of a man of probity who had heard it from Barère, and is confirmed by Barère's *Mémoires*,[106] published subsequently to the *Histoire Parlementaire*. We cannot, therefore, with M. Blanc, reject the story merely on the negative ground that Billaud Varennes, Collot d'Herbois, and Barère did not charge St. Just with this act on the 9th *Thermidor*.

Robespierre might probably have overcome his enemies by an insurrection, for Lescot Fleuriot, the Mayor of Paris, and Henriot, the commander of the National Guard, were devoted to him. But Robespierre had never openly approved this mode of action, though he had sometimes secretly stimulated it. He relied on his *moral* influence, and imagined that he should overcome all opposition by

[103] This is M. Blanc's statement, t. xi. p. 115. But the number executed after Robespierre's retirement seems understated by more than 1000. See Croker's *Essays*, p. 447 sqq.

[104] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii. p. 387.

[105] T. xxxiii. p. 359.

[106] T. ii. p. 213 sq. See also Granier de Cassagnac, *Hist. des Causes, &c.*, t. iii. p. 596; Von Sybel, *Revolutionszeit*, B. iii. S. 218 ff.

the speech which he had prepared. The Committees endeavoured to come to an accommodation with him and his party, and had sent for him for that purpose, 5th *Thermidor* (July 22nd). But a reconciliation was found impracticable. Religious differences seem to have been one of the chief obstacles to it—such were the prejudices and animosities of these free-thinkers! Billaud Varennes and Collot d'Herbois could not endure to hear of a Supreme Being and the immortality of the soul, while St. Just found it horrible that they should blush for a Divinity.[107]

After the failure of this attempt, nothing remained but a trial of strength in the Convention. Robespierre's enemies bound themselves by an oath that they would assassinate him in the midst of the Assembly, if they failed in persuading it against him. Robespierre began the attack by a long speech, 8th *Thermidor* (July 26th), in which he explained and defended his principles, repelled the charge of aiming at a dictatorship. He concluded by proposing to purge and renew both the Committees, to constitute a united government under the Convention, and to punish traitors.[108] His speech, though elaborated and written with great care, was very ill suited to his purpose. It consisted of vague and general charges, and was but the preface to a Report to be delivered the following day by St. Just in which their opponents were to be personally denounced. Hence it excited general alarm, nor would Robespierre respond to the cries of "Name! Name!" Had he spoken his mind clearly, had he denounced without long phrases the crimes that had been committed, the names of those who had committed them, and the good which he proposed to do himself, his declaration might probably have been hailed with applause and the accusation of his enemies decreed. The manner in which his speech was received seems to have alarmed Robespierre himself. He read it in the evening at the Jacobins, where it was heard with great applause; but he called it his "testament of death," talked of drinking the hemlock. His friends exhorted him to try an insurrection, but he declined. On the same evening some emissaries of the Mountain persuaded several members of the Right to join them, and thus to escape the *guillotine* and put an end to the Reign of Terror.[109]

On the morning of 9th THERMIDOR (July 27th), St. Just mounted the tribune of the Convention and began to read his Report. He had announced his intention to do so overnight in the Com-

[107] See his speech, *Hist. Parl.*, t. xxxiv. p. 16.

[108] *Ibid.* t. xxxiii. pp. 406—448.

[109] *Ibid.* t. xxxiv. p. 5; Durand de Maillane, *Hist. de la Convention*, ch. x.

mittee of Public Welfare, and had not concealed that he should attack some of its members. He had scarcely read a few lines when he was violently interrupted by Tallien and Billaud Varennes,[110] who denounced the designs of Robespierre and his accomplices, accused them of a plot to massacre the Convention. These remarks were received with loud and general applause. Robespierre rushed to the tribune, but his voice was drowned with cries of *À bas le tyran!* Tallien violently exclaimed, that if the Convention had not the courage to decree the accusation of the "new Cromwell," he would stab him to the heart; at the same time drawing forth and brandishing a dagger. He then demanded that Henriot and his *état-major* should be accused, that the Assembly should sit in permanence. Both were decreed by acclamation, amidst cries of *Vive la République!* as well as the arrest of Dumas, Boulanges, and Dufraise, three of Robespierre's boldest partisans. Robespierre, who still remained at the tribune, made several ineffectual attempts to obtain a hearing; his voice was always drowned by cries of *À bas le tyran!* and by the bell of the President Thuriot. He looked wistfully at the Mountain, but it gave no signs; he appealed to all sides of the Chamber, as well as to the galleries—all were silent. At length, overcome with rage and vexation, he exclaimed, "President of Assassins! for the last time I demand a hearing!" But his voice had become hoarse, he foamed at the mouth, and finally sank down exhausted. His arrest was now decreed amid cries of *Vive la liberté! Vive la République!* His brother Augustine demanded to share his fate. Couthon, St. Just, and Lebas were also ordered to be arrested.

When the news of the arrest of the five members reached the General Council of the *Commune*, which had assembled about six o'clock in the evening, they drew up a proclamation calling upon the people to rise, ordered the *tocsin* to be rung, the Sections to be convoked, and the cannoniers to repair to the Hôtel de Ville. The Jacobin Club also declared themselves in correspondence with the *Commune*. Henriot, who was half tipsy, had been arrested by two members of the Convention, Coffinhal and Louvet were therefore sent in his place to liberate the prisoners. They brought Robespierre to the Town Hall about nine o'clock in the evening. By orders from the *Commune* the *concierge* of the Luxembourg had refused to receive him, and he had therefore gone to the Bureau of Police, with the view, apparently, of obtaining a trial before the Revolutionary Tribunal; and, as he hoped, a triumphant

[110] The Report was laid on the bar, and will be found in the *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. pp. 6—20. It accused, *by name*, only Collot d'Herbois and Billaud Varennes.

acquittal, like Marat. The other prisoners were also successively brought to the Town Hall.

Meanwhile the Convention had resumed its sitting, and Henriot, who had also been liberated by Louvet and Coffinhal, had proceeded thither with his *état-major* and some cannoniers, with the intention of shutting up the Chamber. On his arrival the President, having put on his hat in sign of distress, exclaimed, "The moment has come when we must die at our posts!" The deputies responded with cries of approbation, the spectators showed the same enthusiasm, and rushed out crying "To arms! let us repulse these wretches!" Henriot, having in vain exhorted the cannoniers to fire, took fright and returned at full gallop to the Hôtel de Ville. The Assembly now proceeded to outlaw him, as well as the five arrested members, and all functionaries who should take part against the Convention.[111]

It soon became evident that the tide of public opinion had turned. At the summons of the *Commune* the Sections had assembled about nine o'clock in the evening, and the insurgents had desired them to march their battalions to the Hôtel de Ville. But they were in a state of uncertainty; only some vague accounts had reached them of a quarrel between the Convention and the *Commune*, and therefore for the most part they sent but a few men to the Hôtel de Ville; while, on the arrival of a summons from the Convention, their battalions proceeded thither, defiled through the hall, and swore to protect the Assembly. As the sections of the faubourgs St. Antoine and St. Marceau alone showed any willingness to respond to the appeal of the *Commune*, the Convention, under these circumstances, found itself strong enough to begin the attack. Barras and Fréron were despatched before midnight with two columns against the Hôtel de Ville; while a sufficient guard, with artillery, was left to protect the Assembly.

Meanwhile, at the Hôtel de Ville, the Council of the *Commune*, with Robespierre and the other outlawed Deputies, were sitting in conclave. An insurrection was debated. Robespierre was at first irresolute; but as the night wore on, and no other hope appeared, he reluctantly consented to a rising. In conjunction with St. Just, he signed a letter to Couthon, who had not yet arrived, inviting him to come and aid the insurrection, as well as a proclamation to the same purpose, addressed to his own section of the *Piques*; but such was his agitation, that to the latter he only affixed the two first letters of his name.[112]

[111] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. p. 69. [112] Blanc, t. xi. p. 251 sqq.

The case did not seem altogether desperate. The Place de Grève was filled with armed men and cannons; the aid of the Sections was confidently anticipated, from their having sent deputations. But soon after midnight rumours began to arrive of their defection; emissaries from the advanced guard of the Conventional forces began to penetrate among the armed masses in front of the Hôtel de Ville, raised the cry of *Vive la Convention!* which was answered by several voices; the proclamation of outlawry was read, on which the crowd dispersed. When Henriot descended, he found that all his troops and cannoniers had vanished. At the same time the heads of Barras and Fréron's columns were beginning to appear; presently they surrounded the Hôtel de Ville, with loud shouts of *Vive la Convention Nationale!* Some of them penetrated into the Council Chamber, when a strange sight presented itself. The elder Robespierre was seen, his jaw broken by a pistol-bullet;[113] Lebas had blown out his brains; Augustine Robespierre had thrown himself out of window, but survived the fall; Couthon had contrived to escape from the Council Chamber, but was seized by the mob and nearly thrown into the Seine; Coffinhal, accusing Henriot of cowardice, had thrown him out of window into a drain; he himself succeeded in escaping and concealing himself two or three days in an island in the Seine, but was ultimately captured; St. Just alone awaited his fate with tranquillity.

Robespierre was conveyed to the apartments of the Committee of Public Welfare, where, stretched on a table wounded and dejected, his countenance bloody and disfigured, he was exposed to the gaze, the abuse, and the maledictions of the spectators. His former colleagues came to insult him, struck him, spat in his face; the clerks of the bureau pricked him with their pen-knives.[114] In the course of the forenoon he was transferred to the *Conciergerie*, and thence brought before the Revolutionary Tribunal, together with his accomplices. After their identity had been proved, they were sent to the scaffold, about five o'clock in the evening of 10th *Thermidor*.

The *guillotine* had on this occasion been replaced in the Place de la Révolution. The windows along the line of streets through which the procession was to pass had been hired at large sums, and were mostly filled by well-dressed women. Robespierre was placed in a cart between Henriot and Couthon, who were also mutilated. The *gendarmes* pointed him out with their swords to

[113] It is doubtful whether he had attempted to commit suicide, or whether he was shot by Méda, a *gendarme*; but, on the whole, the former seems the more probable account.

[114] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiv. p. 94.

the mob, who shouted *À mort le tyran!* His jaw was wrapped in a bloody cloth; his face already bore the lividness of death. Of the twenty-one persons that were executed with him, Robespierre mounted the scaffold last. He uttered a piercing shriek when the executioner tore the bandage from his neck. The fall of his head was hailed by the crowd with shouts of applause.

Robespierre had few or none of the qualities which are commonly supposed to characterise the leaders of great revolutions. He had neither commanding ability, nor personal courage, nor the popular manners and address which conciliate friends and partisans; his person was small and mean, his voice shrill and disagreeable, his countenance repulsive, his habits selfish and egotistical in the extreme. He had none of the coarseness that marked the period. He dressed himself with scrupulous neatness; continued to wear hair-powder, though the disuse of it was a distinctive mark of Jacobinism; abhorred the *bonnet rouge* and the slang of the Revolution. He had the profoundest sense of his own talents, and especially of his own virtue. His image was displayed in every art in his apartments. To what then must be attributed the influence of such a man in those turbulent times? First, he seemed to be the living image of Rousseau's sentimentality, which played so great a part in the Revolution. His discourses were made up of commonplaces from Rousseau about the rights of man and the sovereignty of the people, which he continuously and monotonously repeated, without adding a single new idea of his own.[115] But amidst these generalities there was always a particular passage of sentiment and pathos respecting himself, his merits, the labours of his painful career, his personal sufferings. These appeals, which were aided by his pale and melancholy visage, had a great effect especially upon the women, and came so regularly that the pocket-handkerchiefs were got ready beforehand.[116] By dint of labour he had acquired a style that bore some distant resemblance to Rousseau's. He was also looked up to for his disinterestedness and integrity, and it must be owned that these qualities have never been successfully impeached. It is said that at his lodgings were found only an *assignat* of fifty livres, and some orders of the Constituent Assembly for his pay as deputy, which he had not used.[117] His passion was not avarice but ambition, springing from boundless egotism and pride. His cautiousness, cunning, and perseverance were among the chief means of his success. He had the art to

[115] Garat, *Mémoires in Hist. Parl.*, t. xviii. p. 333.
[116] Michelet, *Hist. de la Révol.*, t. iii. liv. vi. ch. vi.
[117] Blanc, t. xi. p. 263.

destroy his opponents without exposing himself, by setting them against one another and then withdrawing from the scene of danger. But there was one point of his character which fully identified him with the spirit of the Revolution. He had no compunction in sacrificing human life to any extent. In his case, however, this does not appear to have arisen, as with Collot d'Herbois, Fouché, Carrier, and other monsters of the period, from a mere savage thirst for human blood, but because he thought such a course a necessary means for carrying out his fanatical policy.

With the death of Robespierre the Reign of Terror may be said to have ended. From the first establishment of the Revolutionary Tribunal down to the 9th *Thermidor*, between 2000 and 3000 persons had perished by the *guillotine* in Paris.[118] More than a third of these victims were persons belonging to the lower classes, such as workmen, soldiers, semstresses and women servants. Bailleul, who was seven months in the Conciergerie, says that almost all the persons who perished under his eyes belonged to the class of citizens, and even smaller citizens. There were among them domestic servants, cobblers, and even a nightman!'[119] During this period, the public executioner was accustomed to apply daily to the Revolutionary Tribunal, to know how many carts would be required. But the Reign of Terror was not only oppressive and dreadful through these executions; it interfered tyrannically in all the affairs of life. All the journals were subjected to a censorship; letters were officially and publicly opened at the post-office; the taxes were unjustly levied; requisitions for money, horses, and other articles were arbitrarily, and often fraudulently, made by the public officers under terror of the *guillotine*.[120] Nobody, not even the Treasury, could tell the sums levied. To be rich was often a cause of accusation, and always a certain ground of condemnation. Cambon, the finance minister, used to call this "coining money on the Place de la Révolution with the balance of the *guillotine*."[121]

It has been thought that if the *coup d'état* of the 9th *Thermidor* had been favourable to Robespierre, the French Republic would have terminated with him instead of Napoleon, and that, once in possession of supreme power, he would have used it with moderation. But we must confess our opinion that though he had the art to supplant his enemies, he had neither the genius, nor the courage, nor the material resources at his disposal, which would

[118] According to the *Hist. Parl.* (t. xxxiv. p. 97) 2669. Cf. Croker, *Essays*, p. 449.

[119] *Examen, &c.*, t. ii. p. 216.

[120] See Robespierre's *Papers*, No. 38, and *Corr. inédite du Comité de Salut Public*, ap. Granier de Cassagnac, t. iii. p. 614 sq.

[121] Barère, *Mém.* t. ii. p. 129.

have enabled him for any considerable time, to have been the ruler and dictator of a great nation. The facility with which his overthrow was effected shows that his influence was already on the wane; and it seems probable that nothing but a military despotism could have rescued France from the anarchy into which she had fallen.

CHAPTER VI.

We must now direct our view for a while to the general affairs of Europe; among which the state of Poland, to which we have already alluded in the preceding chapter,[1] first claims our attention.

The first partition of Poland and the constitution of 1775, guaranteed by Russia,[2] had placed it at the mercy of that Power, more especially by means of the Permanent Council composed of Russian partisans, and directed by the Russian ambassador. King Stanislaus Poniatowski himself was but the mere creature of the Empress Catherine II., and had disgusted the Poles by the subserviency which he displayed towards her and Potemkin. Poland, in short, was administered almost as if it already formed a Russian province. Rumours of a fresh partition, which should reduce it in reality to that condition, were afloat, when the breaking out of the war between Russia and the Porte, in 1787, seemed to offer an opportunity for throwing off her yoke. The patriot party, led by Ignatius and Stanislaus Potocki, Kollontay, Kosciuszko, Malachowski and others, determined to embrace it.

Catherine II., desirous that the Poles should assist her in her war against the Turks, proposed an alliance for that purpose to Stanislaus Augustus and the Permanent Council. Such an alliance, however, was contrary to ancient treaties subsisting between Poland and the Porte; and King Stanislaus, however willing to assist his mistress, was unable to do so without appealing to the constitutional, or four-years diet, which was to meet in October 1788. But as we have related in a former chapter,[3] a complete change had now been effected in the political aspect of Europe through the triple alliance between Great Britain, the United Provinces, and Prussia, with a view to oppose the designs of Russia and Austria; and the Polish patriots, reckoning on the aid of Prussia and her allies, resolved to make a stand for liberty.

[1] Supra, p. 162. See for the affairs of Poland, Ferrand, *Hist. des trois démembrements de la Pologne*; Oginski, *Mém. sur la Pologne et les Polonais* depuis 1788 jusqu'à 1815 (a work marked by candour and good feeling); Jekel, *Polens Staatsveränderungen*; Ségur, *Règne de Fred. Guillaume II.*, t. iii. ch. 12; K. A. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. iv. Kap. 28; Castéra, *Vie de Catherine II.*, sub fin.

[2] See Vol. III. p. 467.

[3] See Vol. III. B. vi. ch. viii.

Great efforts were made by men of talent and energy to be elected as nuncios to an Assembly which, it was believed, would alter and fix the destinies of their country. Their first triumph was to convert the Diet, the day after it met, into a Confederation (Oct. 7th), thus obviating the *liberum veto*, and leaving matters to be decided by a majority of votes. A note presented to the Diet by Count Bucholtz, the Prussian minister, Oct. 12th, strongly protesting, in the name of his master, against the alliance proposed by Russia,[4] inspired the patriots with unbounded confidence, especially as the Prussian Cabinet appeared resolved to support its policy by arms; and the Russian ambassador found himself compelled to withdraw his proposal of an alliance. It must be remembered, therefore, as an important element in weighing the subsequent conduct of the King of Prussia towards the Poles, that it was he who first sought their friendship, and by promises and professions encouraged them to expose themselves to all the dangers of a rupture with Russia. Nor did he stop here. He approved the projects of the Poles for reforming their constitution, and liberating themselves from Russian influence. These projects were invariably communicated to the Prussian minister, and to Hailes, the English resident at Warsaw; and when the Russian minister notified that the Empress would regard the slightest change made in the constitution of 1775 as a violation of treaties, the Prussian Cabinet declared, in a note of Nov. 19th, that no previous guarantee could prevent the Poles from improving their constitution.

Thus encouraged, the Diet, in spite of the threats of Russia, abolished the Permanent Council, Jan. 18th 1789, increased the army, and instituted a Council of War, independent of the King. But further reforms were too long delayed. It is probable that if the constitution of May 3rd 1791 had been established a year or two earlier, before the union of Prussia and Russia, with regard to the affairs of France, had altered all Frederick William's views as to Poland, she would not have lost the Prussian alliance, and that her liberties might have been saved. There was, however, another condition necessary to secure the continued friendship of Prussia. That Power had long coveted the possession of Dantzic and Thorn. In April 1789 the Marquis Lucchesini was sent to Warsaw to negociate for the cession of those places, with instructions to denounce as an imposture the idea that Frederick William desired a fresh partition of Poland; to assert that he sought only the glory of delivering Europe from the ambition of the barbarians of

[4] *Mém.* d'Oginski, t. i. p. 35 sqq.

the North, and of restoring Poland to her former position and liberty. Certain compensations were to be offered to the Poles, and especially an advantageous treaty of commerce with Prussia, England, and Holland. Several of the patriot party were of opinion that the cession should be made.[5] It was advocated by the English ministry, though not by the merchants of England; and probably it might have secured the Prussian alliance, and have deprived that country of any motive for a second partition of Poland. But it was opposed by a numerous party in the Diet, and especially by those who were in the interest of Russia. Prussia in consequence abandoned the project for the present, but she still kept her eyes fixed in that direction. Meanwhile, as a war with Austria appeared imminent, Frederick William, towards the end of 1789, expressed his desire of forming an intimate connection with the Poles; and urged them to fix, as soon as possible, their form of government. In January 1790, the Prussian minister signified that his Court approved of all the reforms hitherto adopted by the Diet; proposed a defensive alliance, coupled with a reduction of duties on Polish commodities; and though he concealed not how much the cession of Thorn and Dantzic was desired, he did not insist upon that point, and all mention of it was omitted in the defensive treaty concluded at Warsaw March 29th 1790. In the treaty concluded between Prussia and the Ottoman Porte in the previous January, it had been agreed that Galicia, which had fallen to the share of Austria in the first partition of Poland in 1772, should be wrested from her; and the Cabinet of Berlin was inclined to restore this province, or, at all events, a part of it, containing the salt works of Wieliczka, to the Poles, as an equivalent for the cession of Dantzic and Thorn. But, as we have said, the majority of the Diet were averse to cede those ports, especially Dantzic, the key of the Vistula, and the subject was therefore dropped.[6] The sixth article of the treaty of Warsaw is the most important, as having direct reference to Russia.[7] It purported that if any foreign Power whatever, in consequence of preceding acts and stipulations, should assume the right of meddling in the internal affairs of the Polish Republic, his Prussian Majesty would first employ his good offices to prevent any hostilities that might arise from such a pretension; and that if these should fail, and Poland should be attacked, he would consider himself bound

[5] *Mém.* d'Oginski, t. i. p. 34.

[6] The correspondence between the Kings of Prussia and Poland on this subject will be found in Herzberg, *Recueil*, t. iii. p. 12 sqq., and in Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 125 sqq. (2nd ed.)

[7] See Koch et Schöll, *Hist. des Traités*, t. xiv. p. 119. The treaty is in Martens, *Recueil*, t. iv. p. 471.

to afford the assistance stipulated in the fourth article of the present treaty, by which it was agreed that Prussia should furnish 30,000 men.

Meanwhile the framing of the new constitution was proceeding very slowly. The ill success of the Poles in their attempts to establish their independence must in a great measure be ascribed to themselves. Some of the magnates had sold themselves unreservedly to the enemies of their country; others, who played the double game of patriots, were only still more dangerous to her. Amongst the former were Branicki, the Crown General, who had married a niece of Potemkin's, and Count Rzewuski; among the latter, the most conspicuous was Felix Potocki, Marshal of Lithuania; but the King himself was included in this category. Potocki affected liberal principles, and, in common with Prince Adam Czartoryski, Malachowski, Marshal of the Diet, and many other nobles, had caused himself to be admitted a citizen of Warsaw. At length the new constitution was promulgated May 3rd 1791.[8] The principal articles of it were, that the Roman Catholic faith should be the religion of the State, though dissenters were allowed the exercise of their worship, and full participation in all civil rights; the *liberum veto* was abolished; and, what was most important of all, the crown was declared hereditary. The discussion of this article had been attended with great difficulties. To many of the Poles, to abandon the right of election seemed to be to sacrifice their liberties, especially as every noble might aspire to the throne. The succession was settled, upon the death of King Stanislaus, upon Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, and, in the event of his decease without male issue, on the husband whom he might select for his daughter, with the consent of the States. Should the reigning House become extinct, then the elective right was to revert to the nation. The Elector of Saxony, however, was far from being dazzled with the splendid but precarious offer of the Polish crown. He replied evasively, and delayed a definitive answer till April 1792; when he gave a conditional assent, dependent on the approval of the neighbouring Courts, and on certain changes to be made in the constitution.[9] The constitution of May 3rd, and especially the article respecting the hereditary succession of the crown, was far from being popular. This article was carried in the Diet only by a small majority, while of sixty *Dietines* or provincial Diets, only ten adopted it.[10]

[8] A *résumé* of it will be found in Koch and Schöll, *Ibid.* p. 125, and in Oginski, *Mém.*, t. i. p. 130 sqq.

[9] Oginski, t. i. p. 140.

[10] Essen's *Bericht*, ap. Hermann; *Gesch. Russlands*, B. vi. S. 354 ff.

Yet the elective right had mainly contributed to nourish anarchy in Poland, and to afford the neighbouring Powers a pretence for interfering in its affairs. The Russian party, by way of thwarting the designs of Prussia on Dantzic and Thorn, had contrived to obtain the insertion of an article prohibiting, under any circumstance, the transfer of any portion of the territory or sovereign rights of Poland to a foreign Power. Nevertheless Frederick William II., both directly,[11] and through his ambassador, Lucchesini, announced his satisfaction at the happy revolution which had been accomplished, especially with regard to the establishment of the succession in the House of Saxony; and he expressed his desire to give some proofs of his friendship for the Polish nation. These, however, as appeared from the result, were mere diplomatic compliments, on which the Poles laid too much stress.

The Empress Catherine II., on the other hand, viewed the proceedings of the Poles with a displeasure which she did not attempt to conceal. Although the new constitution substituted an hereditary for an elective monarchy, and maintained the nobility and their privileges, yet the patriot nobles, by their liberal measures, and especially by demanding the citizenship of Warsaw, seemed to adopt the doctrine of equality; and Catherine pretended to recognise in the enthusiasm and effervescence which reigned in Poland, the germ of those principles which agitated France, and menaced every throne in Europe. The altered state of things at the commencement of 1792 enabled her to wreak her vengeance on the unhappy Poles. The Courts of Berlin and Vienna were now reconciled, and the Peace of Jassy, between Russia and the Turks, to which the English and Dutch had acceded, enabled Catherine to dispose freely of her forces. Under these circumstances she made a particular arrangement with Austria, and a secret treaty with Prussia, by which Poland was sacrificed. It was not difficult for her to get up a strong party in Poland itself, where, indeed, she had already numerous adherents, and where many of the grandees were disgusted at being excluded from all chance of the throne. Among these last, the principal were Felix Potocki, Severin Rzewuski, and Branicki, the Crown General. These nobles were invited to Jassy, whence they proceeded to St. Petersburg, and formed with the Russian Cabinet a conspiracy for the overthrow of the new constitution. King Stanislaus, the slave of Catherine, lent himself to the same design. All the projected

[11] See his Letter to Count Golt, in Ségur, *Règne de Fr. Guillaume II.*, t. iii. *Pièces Justif.* p. 252; and that to Stanislaus, May 23rd, ap. Oginski, t. i. p. 140.

reforms were delayed; the public offices were filled with the open or secret adherents of Russia; Branicki was appointed minister at war, and all preparations for defence were neglected.[12]

The result of these plots was manifested by the CONFEDERATION OF TARGOWITZ, May 1792, formed with the avowed object of restoring what may be called the Russian Constitution of 1775. About the same time Catherine published a sort of manifesto, in which she declared the new constitution illegal and dangerous, and intimated to the Poles that they must return to their ancient laws, or she would constrain them by force. The manifest of the Confederation had also been prepared at St. Petersburg, and Potocki, Branicki, and Rzewuski only returned into Poland with the Russian troops. The majority of the Poles, however, still continued to retain their confidence in King Stanislaus and in the King of Prussia. They had intrusted the former with the largest force they had ever yet raised; and on the announcement of Catherine's intentions, the Diet formally called on Prussia to fulfil the conditions of the Treaty of Warsaw. But Lucchesini now announced that as his master had had no share in the new constitution, so he did not mean to assist its adherents. Yet in this state of things the Diet, after publishing a Declaration in answer to that of Russia, and declaring their intention to defend their rights, adjourned themselves, May 30th, for an indefinite period, and thus put themselves in the power of Stanislaus and his ministry.

Stanislaus, however, for a while kept up appearances, and he addressed a letter to Frederick William II. calling on him to fulfil his engagements (May 31st). The Prussian King in his answer (June 8th) stated—what was hardly true—that he had never approved of the new constitution, though he had done nothing to hinder it; that, but for this constitution, and the measures taken to uphold it, Russia would never have resorted to coercive measures; that, whatever his friendship for Stanislaus, the state of things had completely altered since the defensive alliance was made; that the present conjuncture, having arisen since the constitution of May 3rd, could not be brought under the obligations of the Treaty of Warsaw; that consequently he was not bound to oppose the present attacks of Russia, so long as the patriotic party persisted in their views; but if this party would reconsider them, he would unite with Russia and Austria in endeavouring to conciliate matters.

[12] *Homme d'état*, t. i. p. 384.

Some of the allegations of this letter were, no doubt, true enough. The policy of Herzberg and an alliance with the Poles and Turks against Russia had fallen into discredit on the disgrace of that minister; the French declaration of war against Austria, and the alliance of Prussia with the latter Power, had made a great alteration in the state of things, though hardly enough to release Frederick William from his solemn obligations. It has been alleged in his defence that he was alarmed at the resemblance between some of the speeches made in the Diet and those of the French revolutionists; and that to carry on a war with Russia and France at the same time was an absolute impossibility.[13] We have, however, before had occasion to remark,[14] that the war with France was little more than a screen and pretence for Prussia's selfish designs upon Poland. In fact, months before Catherine had avowed her designs, and when the war between Austria and France, though imminent, was not yet declared, the Cabinets of Berlin and St. Petersburg had already come to an understanding upon the affairs of Poland; and Catherine, as we have already said, had offered Frederick William a share in the second partition of that country, provided that, in conjunction with Austria, he should consent to march against France.[15]

King Stanislaus issued a proclamation, July 4th, calling on the Poles to defend their independence, and asserting that he was resolved to share their fortunes. Yet instead of proceeding to the camp he had remained at Warsaw, though the Russian army, 100,000 strong, had entered Poland in May. He had, indeed, already entered into a secret understanding with Russia; and had written a letter to the Empress proposing to her Prince Constantine as his successor, imploring her to take a compassionate view of his situation. He had also prevented the Polish army, of which his nephew Joseph Poniatowski was commander-in-chief, from undertaking anything important, had in fact forbidden his nephew to venture upon a battle. Yet the Poles had proved in several skirmishes that they had not degenerated from their ancient valour. In these affairs Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who had received his military education in France, and completed it under Gates and Washington in the American war of liberation, distinguished himself by his valour and conduct. His exploit at Dubienka, July 17th, where, with 4000 Poles, he had maintained his post against the efforts of 18,000 Russians, showed what might have been

[13] See Menzel, *loc. cit.*
[14] Supra, p. 88.
[15] See the Duke of Brunswick's *Letter* to Bischofswerder, February 19th 1792, and Hardenberg's remarks upon it, *Hommes d'état*, t. i. p. 353 sq.

accomplished by courage and resolution. Yet a few days after (July 23rd), Stanislaus acceded to the Confederation of Targowitz. Catherine had directed him to do so in her reply to his letter, as the sole condition on which she could continue to call herself his sister and friendly neighbour. Felix Potocki was proclaimed marshal of the Confederation August 2nd, which was now called the "Confederation of the Crown;" an armistice was concluded, the command of the Polish army was restored to the ancient generals, the troops assembled near Warsaw were dismissed, and the Russians occupied Praga, a suburb of that city. The confederates of Targowitz being now masters of the government, appointed an executive commission of six, who assumed the sovereign power, and left the King not a shadow of authority.

The Prussians were now to play their part. A treaty for the partition of Poland had been signed between the Cabinets of Berlin and St. Petersburg January 4th 1793, to which Austria had agreed, expecting to obtain indemnities in France. A Prussian army under Mollendorf occupied Great Poland, and on January 16th 1793, a Declaration was published stating that the grounds for this step were, the disturbances that had arisen in Poland in consequence of the new constitution, established without consulting neighbouring Powers; the secret agitations still kept up, to the danger of the public peace; and especially the propagation of French principles in Poland, which excited in the King of Prussia apprehensions for the safety of his own dominions. Under these circumstances, being about to undertake another campaign, he had come to an agreement with the Courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg that it would be impolitic to leave an enemy behind him; and it only remained for the well-disposed inhabitants to deserve his protection by their quiet behaviour.[16] This was followed by another Declaration, directed against Dantzic, Feb. 24th, and charging the inhabitants with having displayed for a long series of years an unfriendly feeling towards Prussia, harbouring the dangerous sect of Jacobins, supplying the enemy with provisions, &c. Nothing could be more unfounded than these charges against the Poles of entertaining French revolutionary principles. So far from there being any Jacobin clubs in Poland, her most distinguished orators denounced the French levellers, who in turn abused the Poles, and ridiculed their new constitution.[17] The Council and citizens of Dantzic offered to

[16] *Politisches Journal*, January 1793, ap. Menzel, B. iv. S. 394. Cf. *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 193.

[17] Ségur, *Règne de Fr. Guillaume II.*, t. iii. p. 152 note; Oginski, *Mém.*, t. i. p. 226.

surrender, on condition that their ancient constitution should be preserved, and that the fortifications of the town should remain in possession of the municipality, and be garrisoned by their troops. These terms were refused, Dantzic was blockaded by General Von Raumer, March 8th, the outworks were gradually taken, and on April 8th it opened its gates.

Frederick William had published a patent on the 25th of March, announcing to the states and inhabitants of the Palatinates of Posen, Gnesen, Kalisch, Siradia, Lentschitz, Rava, Plotzk, the town and convent of Czenstochau, the districts Wielun, Cujavia, Dobrzyn, the towns of Dantzic and Thorn, that they were henceforth to consider themselves Prussian subjects. They were invited to assemble as soon as possible in a Diet, in order to settle these matters in an amicable manner. But, without waiting for its decision, they were to regard Frederick William as their sovereign, and to present themselves to do homage to him. A proclamation of the Russian general of a similar tenor appeared April 7th, announcing that he took possession for the Empress, of the counties of Poloczk, Vilna, Novogrodeck, Brzesc, the greater part of Volhynia, of what remained of Podolia, and of the Palatinates of Kiew and Bracklaw. The provinces now seized by Frederick William were put on the same footing with those previously acquired, and received the name of *South Prussia*. Homage was done to that monarch at Posen, May 3rd.

The Diet of Grodno assembled June 17th 1793. The Permanent Council had been previously re-established at the instance, or rather by the threats, of Sievers, the Russian ambassador. The Diet exhibited the greatest reluctance to enter into the treaties demanded by Russia and Prussia for the dismemberment of Poland; and they appealed against them, but of course without effect, to all the Courts with which the Republic was connected. Finding themselves at length compelled to submit, they endeavoured to make a separate treaty with Russia, in the hope that Catherine would defend them against the claims of Frederick William; and some authors have asserted that the Russian Empress made them a promise to that effect, although the two Courts had declared that they would treat only jointly.[18] However this may be, the Diet could at first be brought only to appoint a deputation to treat with Russia. The treaty with that Power, signed July 22nd, and ratified by the Diet August 17th 1793,[19] transferred to Russia the provinces already named, comprising a

[18] Ségur, *loc. cit.*

[19] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 530.

surface of 4553 geographical square miles, and a population of more than three million souls.

The Diet, after the arrangement of this treaty, with a credulity which seems to have marked the Polish character, requested Sievers to engage the mediation of his sovereign with Frederick William, in order to induce him to restore the provinces which he had occupied, and to indemnify the Republic for the wrongs and losses which that act had occasioned! But Sievers insisted that they should appoint a deputation to treat with the Prussian minister; and, after a violent debate, the votes being equally balanced, Stanislaus Augustus turned the scale in favour of Prussia, in the hope, apparently, of saving some small remnant of his dominions. But the members of the Diet, as if by common consent, remained obstinately silent, although Sievers caused several of them to be arrested by his Cossacks, and surrounded the chamber with troops and cannon. In this state of things, Bialinski, Marshal of the Diet, a devoted partisan of Russia, having thrice demanded whether the Assembly authorised the deputation to sign the treaty with the King of Prussia, and receiving no answer, interpreted the silence as consent, and directed the deputation to conclude.

The Treaty of Grodno with Prussia was signed September 25th 1793.[20] The provinces provisionally seized by Frederick William II. were ceded to that monarch. They contained 1061 square miles of territory, peopled by more than three and a half million souls.

The Confederation of Targowitz having fulfilled its purpose, Catherine caused it to be annulled, and the old constitution was nominally restored, September 15th. The Prussian treaty was almost immediately followed by a treaty of alliance between the Polish Republic and the Empress Catherine, October 16th.[21] This convention, under the names of an indissoluble union and defensive alliance, virtually rendered the Poles subject to Russia. The King and Republic of Poland engaged to leave the direction of military and political matters to the Empress and her successors; her troops were to have free entry into Poland; and the Republic were to conclude no treaties with foreign Powers, nor even to negociate with them, except in concert with Russia.

Among the last acts of the Diet of Grodno were a revision of the constitution, the restoration of the King to the prerogatives of which he had been deprived by the Confederation of Targowitz, and the readjustment of what remained of Poland into eleven Palatinates, eight in Poland and three in Lithuania. It separated November 24th, after annulling all the acts of the Confederation of

[20] Martens, *Ibid.*, p. 544. [21] *Ibid.* p. 536.

Targowitz, and thus, among other things, re-establishing a military order for those who should distinguish themselves in a war against Russia. For suffering these decrees to pass, through inadvertence, Sievers was superseded in the Russian embassy by General Igelström, a man of still more violent character. Igelström compelled the King and Permanent Council to cancel the Decrees by what was called a *Universal*, January 10th 1794.

After the disastrous campaign of 1792, several of the Polish patriots, as Kollentay, Ignatius Potocki, Kosciuszko, and others, had retired into Saxony. But they were still animated with the hope of rescuing their country from oppression; and it was not long before an arbitrary act of the Russian ambassador seemed to offer an opportunity for accomplishing their purpose. Igelström had directed the Permanent Council to reduce the Polish army to 15,000 men. This measure, besides wounding the national feelings, was unjust in a pecuniary point of view. Many officers had purchased their posts, and depended on them for subsistence; some were in advance for the pay of the soldiers, others had enlisted them at their own expense. This offence was given at a moment when the national feeling was already in a state of fermentation. Much excitement and turbulence had been displayed in the *dietines* assembled in February 1794 for the elections under the new constitution. The symptoms were so alarming that Igelström deemed it necessary to form a Russian camp near Warsaw, to retain that city in obedience. The insurrection of 1794 was commenced by Madalinski, a general of brigade, stationed at Pultusk, about eight leagues from Warsaw. Madalinski, having been ordered to reform his corps according to the new regulations, refused to do so till they had received their pay, which was two months in arrear; and he marched towards Cracow, skirting the provinces recently annexed to Prussia. Kosciuszko, who was at Dresden, hearing of this movement, hastened to Cracow, where he was proclaimed generalissimo, March 24th 1794. The Russian garrison of that place had marched against Madalinski. Kosciuszko, having assembled the citizens, proclaimed the constitution of May 3rd 1791, amidst the greatest enthusiasm. He also issued a proclamation calling on the whole nation to assert their independence, and employed himself in organising his little army, to which he added a number of peasants armed with scythes. With these tumultuary forces he attacked and defeated a body of 7000 Russians at Raslawice, April 4th; an affair, indeed, of no great importance, but which encouraged the troops with hopes of further victories.

The King and Permanent Council, in a *Universal* published April 11th, declared the leaders of the insurrection rebels and traitors, ordered them to be brought to trial, exhorted the Poles to obedience, warned them by the example of France of the dangers of rebellion. To this, however, little heed was given. The forces of Kosciuszko increased daily, and Igelström, distrusting the garrison of Warsaw, first occupied the castle and other posts with Russian soldiers; subsequently, being compelled to weaken his troops there by detaching some of them against the insurgents, he resolved to disarm the Polish garrison. But this scheme got wind, and the insurrectionary leaders resolved to anticipate it. On the night of April 16th, the Polish garrison and the citizens of Warsaw flew to arms and massacred the Russians wherever they were found in small numbers. A bloody fight ensued in the streets, the Russians retreating from one quarter to another, till at last, after a resistance of thirty-six hours, which cost the Russians 4000 men, killed or made prisoners, Igelström, with the remainder of his troops, succeeded in escaping from the town, and took refuge in the Prussian camp in the vicinity. The citizens of Warsaw now signed the new Confederation, and recognised Kosciuszko as their commander-in-chief; King Stanislaus was deprived of his authority, but treated with the respect due to his rank.

The news of this insurrection was the signal for a rising in Lithuania. The citizens of Vilna flew to arms on the night of April 23rd, and massacred or made prisoners nearly all the Russian garrison. A similar scene took place at Grodno. A criminal tribunal erected at Vilna condemned to death the Bishop Kossakowski, a partisan of Russia. The insurrection now spread rapidly through all the Palatinates. The entire Polish army declared for Kosciuszko; the regiments which had entered the Russian service deserted *en masse*, and ranged themselves under his colours. An ordinance, published at the camp of Polanice May 10th 1794, established a National or Supreme Council of eight members for the government of the Republic. The King was entirely set aside, though suffered to retain his title. Kosciuszko himself had been invested with dictatorial power, which he employed only for the good of his country.

Frederick William II., on learning these events, determined to march in person to the scene of action with 40,000 men; advancing on Cracow, and intending to form a junction with a Russian corps under General Denisoff. Kosciuszko, to prevent this, attacked Denisoff at Szczekociny June 6th. He was not

aware that the Prussians were so near at hand till they fell upon his left wing, and by their superior numbers compelled him to retreat with considerable loss. He now withdrew by way of Radom to Gora, a town about ten leagues from Warsaw, where he entrenched himself. In order to animate the Poles, the Supreme Council published a declaration of war against Prussia June 12th, signed by Ignatius Potocki. On the 15th Cracow surrendered to a Prussian corps; an event which induced the Emperor Francis II. to declare himself. A change had taken place in the counsels of the Court of Vienna, now directed by Thugut. Up to the beginning of June the Austrian arms, directed by the Emperor in person, had been successful against the French in Flanders; but soon after the affair near Charleroi, June 3rd, though the Austrians were again victorious, Francis resolved to abandon his Belgian provinces, and to seek compensation in Bavaria and Poland.[22] Catherine had invited him to intervene in the affairs of Poland by way of counterpoise to Prussia, whose ambitious designs she was desirous of limiting.[23] Having quitted his army, and returned to Vienna, he directed General D'Arnoncourt to announce by a proclamation June 30th, that to avert the danger arising to the Province of Galicia from the disturbances in Poland, he had been ordered to enter that country with his forces.[24] A *corps d'armée* of 17,000 Austrians accordingly marched on Brzesc and Dubnow.

Kosciuszko had retired from Gora to Warsaw. That city was unfortified, and Kosciuszko covered it on its western side by an entrenched camp. He had been followed by Frederick William, who took up a position at Vola, about a league from Warsaw. From his camp at this place he addressed a letter to King Stanislaus August 2nd, demanding the surrender of Warsaw, threatening it with military execution if taken by assault. Stanislaus, who had in fact no authority in the matter, replied, that as Kosciuszko's army lay between the town and the Prussians, he had no power to order its surrender; and he deprecated Frederick William's threats of cruelty and vengeance, as contrary to the example which kings owed to their people, and, as he sincerely thought, at variance with the King of Prussia's personal character.[25]

Many assaults had been delivered, Kosciuszko's entrenchments were falling gradually into the hands of the Prussians, and the capture of Warsaw appeared imminent, when Frederick William, to the surprise of the Poles, suddenly departed with precipitation,

[22] See the next chapter, campaign of 1794.

[23] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 13.

[24] Oginski, *Mém.*, t. i. p. 410.

[25] *Ibid.* t. ii. p. 3 sqq. *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 56.

leaving behind his sick and wounded, and a large part of his baggage (Sept. 6th). Before taking this extreme step, the aide-de-camp Manstein had been sent to demand a conference with the Polish general Zayonczek, on pretence of treating about an exchange of prisoners, but in reality with a design of coming to an understanding with him. Zayonczek, however, told him that as his master had broken his faith with a people who sincerely desired his friendship, they could no longer trust him; and Manstein retired in confusion.[26] The reason for Frederick William's retreat was the breaking out of an insurrection in the provinces recently annexed to Prussia. The Prussian yoke was much more intolerable to the Poles than the Russian: All civil employments in the subjugated provinces were filled by Germans; the inhabitants were subject to a civil and criminal code published in German, and were constrained to learn that tongue. The withdrawal of the Prussian troops for the siege of Warsaw affording an opportunity, an insurrection broke out in Siradia August 23rd, and soon spread to the other provinces of Great Poland. The towns of Posen, Petrikau and one or two others, having Prussian garrisons, were alone retained in obedience. The rebellion was all the more dangerous as the Prussian dominions were at this time threatened in another quarter by the advance of the French. Kosciuszko took advantage of it to despatch Dembrowski with a considerable corps into West Prussia. Dembrowski seized the town of Bromberg and the magazines collected there, and compelled the inhabitants to take an oath of fealty to the Polish Republic; an exploit which occasioned such alarm at Berlin that Prince Hohenlohe with his *corps* was recalled from the Rhine.

But this success was only partial and temporary. On other sides the prospects of the Poles began to lour. A Russian army under Knoring and Souboff had assembled in Lithuania, and as it advanced, that of the Poles melted away. The Lithuanians under General Chléwinski were entirely defeated August 12th, Vilna was compelled to open its gates; and the whole province was speedily recovered by the Russians. Early in September, Suvaroff, recalled from the Turkish frontiers, entered Volhynia with 20,000 men, and directed his march upon Warsaw. On the 18th he dislodged the Polish general Sierakowski, posted with 15,000 men at Krupczyce, near Brzesc, and defeated him next day on the banks of the Bug. The Poles lost 6000 men and thirty guns on this bloody day. Suvaroff having formed a junction with Prince

[26] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 66.

Repnin, who was marching on Warsaw from Grodno, Kosciuszko hastened to oppose them. At Maciewice he met the *corps* of General Fersen, who was waiting for Repnin and Suvaroff, and immediately attacked him, Oct. 10th. But the reinforcements which Kosciuszko expected did not arrive; the Russians, irritated by the carnage at Warsaw, fell with inexpressible fury upon the Poles, and made a terrible slaughter. As the fate of the day hung doubtful, Kosciuszko, with his principal officers and the *élite* of his cavalry, dashed into the thickest of the fight, when his horse having fallen with him, he was made prisoner.[27] He had received some severe wounds in the head and other parts, and was long insensible. On recovering his consciousness he is said to have uttered the words, *Finis Poloniæ!* On this fatal day 3000 more prisoners, including many distinguished officers, and all the artillery and baggage, fell into the hands of the Russians; the field of battle was strewed with the bodies of 6000 Poles.

The news of this disaster struck Warsaw with consternation. Nevertheless the revolutionary leaders resolved not to abandon the national cause. The command-in-chief was confided to Wawrzecki, and Prince Poniatowski was directed to march to the aid of Dembrowski and Madalinski, who were returning from their expedition into Prussia. Poniatowski, by attacking the Prussians at Sochaczen, Oct. 22nd, occasioned a diversion which enabled the two generals to effect their retreat to Warsaw.

De Favrat, who had been appointed to the command of the Prussian army, crossed the Vistula at Viszgorod, and surrounded Warsaw on the western side, while the Russians, under Derfelden and Fersen, invested the suburb of Praga, on the right bank of the Vistula. They were joined towards the end of October by Suvaroff. Praga, though defended by 100 guns, was assaulted and taken by the Russians, and being chiefly built of wood, was almost entirely destroyed by fire, Nov. 4th. Of the Polish garrison, consisting of 26,000 men, 12,000 perished in the assault; 10,000 more were taken prisoners; of the remainder, who endeavoured to escape to Warsaw, 2000 were drowned in the Vistula. The inhabitants of Praga, to the number of 12,000 of both sexes, including infants and aged persons, were massacred. This terrible catastrophe, to which history offers but few parallels, filled Warsaw with consternation and despair. The magistrates were desirous of capitulating, but the troops would not hear of it. At length

[27] Kosciuszko was liberated on the accession of the Emperor Paul. After passing some time in America and England, he established himself at Fontainebleau, and subsequently in Switzerland, where he died in 1817.

the National Council and General Wawrzecki replaced the sovereign power in the hands of Stanislaus; the latter retired with the troops and 122 guns, Nov. 7th; and two days after, Suvaroff, after repairing the bridge over the Vistula, which had been burnt, entered Warsaw. He had refused to grant a capitulation, but had promised the inhabitants that their lives and property should be respected. Wawrzecki was pursued by Denisoff and Fersen. Finding his provisions fail, he dismissed his infantry at Opoczno, and with the other generals and his cavalry endeavoured to reach Galicia; but they were attacked at Radoczyn Nov. 18th, and made prisoners. Most of the leaders of the rebellion were carried into Russia. Such was the end of the Polish insurrection of 1794. In spite of the amnesty promised by Suvaroff, Catherine caused Ignatius Potocki, Mostowski, and other leaders of the insurrection who had remained at Warsaw, to be arrested. The more distinguished patriots were proscribed, their estates were confiscated, and those who had been captured were thrown into dungeons at St. Petersburg, while some thousands of a meaner sort were transported to the deserts of Siberia.

Russia, Austria, and Prussia now quietly divided their blood-stained prey, and Poland was blotted out from the map of Europe. It was arranged by the Convention of St. Petersburg, Jan. 3rd 1795, that besides the Duchy of Courland, a former fief of Poland, Russia should have the Duchy of Semigallia, the district of Pilten, Samogitia, part of the Palatinates of Troki and Chelm, the remainder of those of Vilna, Novogrodeck, Brzesc and Volhynia, comprising a surface of 2030 square miles. To Austria were assigned the town and greater part of the Palatinate of Cracow, the Palatinates of Sandomir and Lublin, and part of those of Chelm, Podlachia and Masovia, containing 834 square miles. The lot of Prussia was the remains of the Palatinates of Rava and Plotzk, part of Masovia, including Warsaw, which the Prussians had not been able to take, and portions of Podlachia, Troki, and Cracovia, altogether 997 square miles. Each of these three shares contained a population of about 1,000,000 souls, some a little more or less. This division was confirmed by a threefold treaty between the Powers, signed at St. Petersburg Oct. 24th 1795.[28] Disputes had, however, arisen between Austria and Prussia about the division of Cracovia, the situation of which renders it important as the key both of Galicia and Silesia. The Prussians were in possession of Cracow, and seemed disposed to retain it by force. The point was reserved for future negociation under the arbitration of the

[28] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 168 sqq. (2nd Ed.)

Empress. It was only through her threat to retain Warsaw that the Prussians were brought to evacuate Cracovia. The Austrians entered that province in January 1796, when the Russians retired from Warsaw, and a Prussian garrison was admitted. The demarcation of Cracovia was finally regulated under Russian mediation, Oct. 21st 1796.[29]

In October 1795 King Stanislaus, who had been sent into a kind of banishment at Grodno, was directed to lay down the crown of Poland, which he had worn since 1764. He signed the Act of Abdication Nov. 25th.[30] A pension of 200,000 ducats was assigned to him. After the accession of Paul I. he took up his residence at St. Petersburg, in which city he died Feb. 12th 1798. Pierre de Biron, last Duke of Courland, had abdicated in favour of Catherine at St. Petersburg March 28th 1795.

Thus was completed, in the reign of Catherine II., the destruction of Poland, whose ruin she had commenced many years before. But she did not long outlive these events. She was carried off by an apoplexy, November 17th 1796, in the sixty-seventh year of her age. The policy of her latter years was marked by her hatred of the French Revolution, modified by a paramount regard to her own interest. She renewed the treaty of commerce with England, which expired in 1786, granted the English fresh privileges, and forbade the importation of French merchandise. She also endeavoured to persuade the Ottoman Porte to expel all the French from their dominions, and sent Kutusoff to Constantinople for that purpose, but without success. By a new treaty with England in 1796, she agreed to despatch twelve ships of the line and eight frigates to join the English fleet, on condition of receiving an annual subsidy of one million sterling, besides the expenses of the squadron; but, at the same time, she ordered her admiral *not to fight*.[31] She was on the point of signing a treaty with England and Austria to supply an army of 60,000 men against the French, but on condition that they should assist her in driving the Turks from Constantinople, when she was surprised by death. She was also implicated at this moment in a war with Persia. Beholding England and the greater part of Europe engaged in a war with France, her restless ambition made her regret having abandoned her projects for the subjugation of Turkey. The anarchy, however, which reigned in Persia since the death of Thamas Kouli Khan, and which was fomented by Russian policy, just as that of Poland had been, for its own interested purposes, inspired Catherine with the hope

[29] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 175. [30] *Ibid.* p. 182.
[31] Castéra, *Vie de Catherine* (*Remarque Add.*)

of extending her conquests in that direction. She dreamt of nothing less than conquering Persia, and reviving the magnificent but impracticable and disastrous plans of Peter the Great for diverting the commerce of the East towards Russia, through the Persian Gulf, the Caspian or the Black Sea. The details of this Asiatic war belong not to our subject. It will suffice to state that an expedition was undertaken early in 1796, under the conduct of Count Valerian Zouboff, one of Catherine's *favourites*. Derband, the capital of Daghestan, was taken. But the army was prevented from penetrating much further by epidemic maladies occasioned by the heats of summer and the immoderate use of fruit; and Paul I. on his accession recalled his troops from this hopeless enterprise.

The character of Catherine II. may be gathered from what has been already said. She had been pretty when young; her countenance was agreeable, and betrayed not the crimes of which she had been guilty, though as she advanced in life it assumed a somewhat sinister expression. She was of middling stature, well proportioned, of a graceful and dignified carriage, though at last too corpulent. Her complexion was light, with blue eyes and chestnut hair.

Catherine was succeeded by her son, Paul I. Petrowitsch. At the funeral of the Empress, Paul resolved to make some atonement to his father's ashes. He directed the tomb in the church of St. Alexander Newski, where the body of Peter III. had lain since 1762, to be opened; the coffin to be placed upon a bed of state, next to that of Catherine, having upon it the imperial crown, which had been brought expressly from Moscow; a love-knot united the two coffins, with the following inscription: "Divided in life, united in death." Alexis Orloff and Prince Baratinski were ordered to attend the funeral, and were kept three hours before the eyes of the spectators. Orloff's nerves carried him through the ordeal without his betraying any emotion, but it was with difficulty that Baratinski could be kept from fainting. Orloff received an intimation that he was permitted to travel, and Baratinski was forbidden to appear at court.[32] It is probable that Paul's conduct in this affair was dictated as much by hatred of his mother as by respect for his father's memory. It was impossible that he should feel any sentiments but those of abhorrence for the unnatural parent who had murdered his father, who had usurped his own crown, who had kept him in retirement at a distance from power, it may be said in disgrace, unprovided with the necessaries

[32] Castéra, liv. xii.

of his condition, who had deprived him of the society and government of his children, and whom he saw prostituting herself, to the latest period of her life, to a continual succession of lovers. It may also be owing to the same cause, that Paul, as we shall have occasion to see, reversed at first much of the policy of his mother, though he, like her, was a determined enemy of the French Revolution.[33] He began his reign by a step which testified his disapprobation of the cruelties exercised in Poland. He restored to liberty more than 14,000 Poles exiled or imprisoned in consequence of the last insurrection. Kosciuszko, Potocki, and many others, were not only liberated, but their estates were also restored to them on their promising to live peaceably.[34]

Of the Scandinavian kingdoms, Denmark, as we have seen, refused to participate in the great convulsion that was agitating Europe. Christian VII. remained the nominal sovereign of that country down to his death in 1808, but imbecility of mind rendered him incompetent to govern. The affairs of Denmark were administered by the Prince Royal, Frederick, afterwards Frederick VII., with the assistance of an able ministry, and especially Count Bernstorff. Under this beneficent Government Denmark enjoyed a remarkable prosperity. The liberties of the people were extended, their grievances abolished, learning, science, and education promoted. The French Revolution found, on the other hand, no more zealous and active opponent than Gustavus III. of Sweden. It was this feeling, which they had in common, that united him with Catherine II. The political differences of these monarchs had assumed the character of personal animosity; but the abhorrence which both felt for the democratic principles of the French converted this feeling into a friendship and union which lasted till the death of Gustavus. The chivalrous but imprudent spirit of Gustavus was flattered with the idea of leading the crusade of the sovereigns against France. He entered into correspondence with *Monsieur*, the Count d'Artois, the Marquis de Bouillé, and other chiefs of the emigration. In the spring of 1791 he repaired to Aix-la-Chapelle, under pretence of taking the waters, but in reality to consult with the French emigrants; and he was concerned in the preparations for Louis XVI.'s unfortunate flight to Varennes. After the failure of that enterprise, he entertained the extravagant and hazardous scheme of landing Swedish and Russian troops in the Seine, marching upon Paris, and suppressing the Revolution.

[33] Tooke's *View of the Russian Empire under Catherine II.*, and *Life of Catherine II.*; Castéra, *Vie de Catherine II.*; Masson, *Mém. Secrets sur la Russie.*

[34] *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 123.

Gustavus was supported in this anti-revolutionary ardour, which amounted almost to Quixotism, by Catherine II. She proposed to him, through General Pahlen, an intimate alliance, and Gustavus readily accepted a proposal which would enable him to be absent from his dominions without apprehension as to his powerful neighbour. Such seems to have been the chief object of the treaty of Drottningholm, concluded Oct. 19th 1791.[35] The treaty is purely a defensive one, in case the dominions of either Power should be attacked; though it is difficult to imagine against what enemies they proposed to defend each other. It is said that Catherine also engaged to protect Gustavus against his own subjects, to pay him subsidies, and to afford him a considerable loan, to be guaranteed however by the Swedish states; but these arrangements do not appear in the treaty. A marriage had also been agreed upon between the King of Sweden's son Gustavus Adolphus and Catherine's granddaughter, the Grandduchess Alexandra.

This Russian alliance was highly unpopular in Sweden. The Swedes viewed with disgust the abandonment of the Turks and Poles to a Power which had seized so great a part of the Swedish dominions; they were indignant at Gustavus's distant and chimerical schemes against France, in a cause of which the majority of the nation disapproved. The country was not in a condition to bear the expense of a war with France, in which the welfare of the people seemed to be sacrificed to the vanity and ambition of the King. In fact the Government was compelled to reduce the value of the state paper currency by one-fourth—a sort of national bankruptcy. The national feeling was displayed in the Diet which Gustavus summoned at Geffle with the view of raising supplies. But though assembled at that remote place in the Gulf of Bothnia, in order the better to coerce it, and surrounded with the King's mercenary troops, it would grant only part of his demands, and proved so refractory that he was compelled to dismiss it (Feb. 24th 1792).

An odious conspiracy for assassinating the King had long existed among some of the Swedish nobles. Plots had been organised for effecting this object at Aix-la-Chapelle, Stockholm, and other places, which had hitherto failed; but the dismissal of the States, and the rumoured unconstitutional projects of Gustavus, brought them to maturity. One of the chief promoters of the King's assassination was General Pechlin, an old man of seventy-two. Several other nobles were implicated in the conspiracy, and especially Counts Ribbing and Horn, and Captain Ankarström. These three men

[35] Martens, t. v. p. 262.

took an oath to murder Gustavus, drew lots to determine who should perpetrate the deed. The lot fell on Ankarström. Besides political enmity, Ankarström had, or conceived he had, personal grounds for hating the King, on the score of an affront received from Gustavus many years previously. After the King's return from Finland, too, in 1788, he had been accused of treason and banished to Gothland, but was shortly after pardoned. These grievances rankled in Ankarström's bosom; and they were aggravated by a considerable loss entailed upon him by the reduction of the currency. Impelled by these feelings, Ankarström in a dastardly manner shot the King in the back at a masquerade given at the Opera House at Stockholm March 16th 1792. Gustavus survived till the 29th, when he expired. During the period which intervened between his wound and his death, he displayed the utmost fortitude and presence of mind, and settled the affairs of his kingdom with all the composure imaginable. His thoughts characteristically reverted to the subject ever uppermost in his mind, the French Revolution; and he expressed a desire to know what Brissot would think of his fate. He was forty-six years of age at the time of his death. The chief conspirators were captured; but Ankarström alone was executed, after three public floggings and other tortures; the rest were either banished from Sweden or confined in fortresses.

Gustavus III.'s son, then in his fourteenth year, succeeded to the crown of Sweden, with the title of Gustavus IV. Adolphus. Till he should attain his majority, the regency was assumed by his uncle Charles, Duke of Sudermania, brother of the late King. The Swedish Court, as we have before had occasion to remark, now adopted a neutral policy; a conduct which produced a misunderstanding with the Court of St. Petersburg. Catherine II. was supposed to be connected with a plot discovered in 1794 to deprive the Duke of Sudermania of the regency. Baron Armfeld, a friend of the late King's, and then Swedish minister at Naples, was suspected to be the chief author of it, and his arrest was determined on; but being apprised of his danger, he fled to St. Petersburg. Another cause of dissension between the two Courts was the publication of the intended marriage of the young King of Sweden with a German princess (Oct. 1795), in spite of Gustavus's promise that he should be united to the Archduchess Alexandra. Catherine having declared that she should consider the proposed marriage of Gustavus Adolphus as a ground of rupture, it was not prosecuted. Towards the autumn of 1796 Gustavus IV., accompanied by his uncle, paid a visit to the Empress at St. Petersburg.

But though the young King was much struck with the charms of the Grandduchess Alexandra, he refused to sign the marriage contract, on the ground that it contained provisions contrary to the religion which he professed, and to the laws and customs of his country. Catherine was furious at this affront. Her death, however, prevented any ill consequences from ensuing, and on the accession of Paul a good understanding was renewed between the two Courts.[36]

The history of the German states at this period is unimportant except in connection with the French Revolution and the affairs of Poland; and it will therefore suffice to offer a few brief remarks on the effects produced on the German people and their governments by the events that were passing in France.

The same spirit which produced the Revolution in that country had penetrated into Germany and even into its courts. It had, as we have seen, animated and influenced Frederick the Great and the Emperor Joseph II. The vast intellectual movement observable throughout Europe in the last half of the eighteenth century, the upheaving, as it were, and throes of the European mind, had given birth almost to the first German literature that can be called original and vernacular. The German authors of this period, like the French *literati* themselves, discarded their former classical and French models, and sought in English literature a new source of inspiration. The works of most of their distinguished writers began to breathe a spirit of liberty. Salzmann, in his romance of *Karl von Karlsberg*, placed before the eyes of his numerous readers a striking and perhaps exaggerated picture of the political and social evils under which they laboured. The epic poet Klopstock gave vent to his aspirations for freedom in several odes. The *Dichterbund*, or band of poets established at Göttingen about the year 1770, of which Count Stolberg was one of the most distinguished members, looked up to Klopstock as their master. In many of Stolberg's pieces love of liberty and hatred of tyrants are expressed with a boldness which must have grated strangely on the ears of some of the German sovereigns. But in general these works were in too high a tone to have much influence on the people. Schiller's early tragedies were calculated to have more effect, especially his *Don Carlos*; which, from the speeches of the Marquis de Posa, has been characterised as a dramatised discourse on the rights of man. Yet when the French Revolution broke out, it found no partisan in Schiller. He augured unfavourably of the Constituent Assembly, thought them incom-

[36] Arndt, *Gesch. Schwedens*; Brown's *Northern Courts*.

petent to establish, or even to conceive, true liberty; foretold the catastrophe of a military despotism.[37] Goethe, his contemporary, regarded the explosion in France as an unwelcome interruption of the tranquil pleasures of polite and cultivated society; Wieland, in his essays on the French Revolution, took the popular side. A more direct form of propagating liberal principles than by literature was by means of clubs and secret societies. The clubs of England and France were most formidable political engines; but then their debates were public and their objects practical. Such associations would not have been suffered in Germany. The reformers of that country had therefore enlisted themselves in a secret society called the *Order of Illuminati*, founded in 1776 by Adam Weishaupt, a professor of canon law at Ingolstadt, and modelled after the constitution of the Jesuits, whose pupil Weishaupt had been. Its members bound themselves to an unreserved obedience to their superiors, were gradually initiated into the mysteries of the society, and went through the successive ranks of priest, mage, regent, and king. Its principles were characteristic of the German mind, far-fetched and eminently unpractical. The grand doctrine which it professed to disseminate was, that the misfortunes of mankind spring from religion and the dominion of the powerful; that as religion had its source in superstition and priestcraft, so the separation of mankind into peoples and states had been accomplished by fortunate pretenders through force and cunning. But by means of the secret schools of wisdom, man would rise from his fallen state, princes and nations would disappear without violence from the face of the earth, the human race would form one great family, and every father of a household, as in former times Abraham and the patriarchs, become the priest and ruler of his family with no other code of law than that dictated by wisdom. In a few years this society numbered thousands of members, belonging chiefly to the higher classes. Its principles seem not to have threatened any very immediate or alarming danger. Nevertheless it was suppressed by Charles Theodore, Elector of Bavaria; Weishaupt was compelled to fly, and found a refuge at Gotha.[38] In other German states the *Illuminati* appear to have been left unmolested.

Prone to reflection, the German mind is not readily excited to action. Little desire was manifested in Germany to imitate the movement in France. It was only in the Rhenish provinces, where the people came into immediate contact with the French, and could be assisted by their armies, that any revolutionary

[37] K. A. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. S. 285. [38] Menzel, *Ibid.*, Kap. 15.

spirit was manifested. An appeal was even ventured on for patriotic gifts in support of the war of the Empire against French principles, and brought in a few hundred thousand florins. The Austrian free-masons, whom Joseph II. had patronised, spontaneously suppressed their meetings, in order, as they told the Emperor, to relieve him of some of his cares in that season of disturbance. Nevertheless Thugut, the Austrian minister, deemed some precaution necessary. Thugut had resided at Paris during the early days of the Revolution, and from an acquaintance with its scenes and personages, had imbibed a deep hatred of popular government, as well as the conviction that if the French Court and clergy had prevented by means of the police the philosophers and *beaux esprits* from propagating their principles, the outbreak would never have occurred. Hence he was led to forbid all social unions, and to subject the press to a rigid censorship. Even old and standard works, whose contents were at all of an equivocal character, were prohibited. No allusions were permitted in the theatre to political or religious matters. It was forbidden to represent such plays as *Otto von Wittelsbach*, *Hamlet*, *Macbeth*, *King John*, *Richard II.* &c., as familiarising the minds of the spectators with the murder or deposition of kings; *King Lear*, lest it should be thought that misfortune turned the heads of monarchs; still less plays directly provocative of revolutionary ideas, as *Egmont*, *Fiesco*, *William Tell*.[39]

The extraordinary career of Thugut deserves to be briefly mentioned. He was born at Linz, the son of a boatman on the Danube, and received his education at the Oriental Academy at Vienna. In 1754 he was sent with the Austrian embassy to Constantinople, and became consecutively, Interpreter, Agent, Resident, and Internuntius. He distinguished himself by his activity during the war between Turkey and Russia, and was subsequently employed as ambassador and negociator in all congresses and acts of state. He entered the ministry a little before the death of Prince Kaunitz, who had so long directed the Austrian policy; and to spare the feelings of the aged and declining chancellor, he acted as his subordinate, and apparently under his direction. On the death of the prince, June 27th 1794, Thugut obtained the supreme direction of affairs. With an aptitude for business, he united an idleness which sometimes proved detrimental to the public service. He was accustomed to read only the more important despatches, and on his going out of office, upwards of 2000 unopened letters and *estafettes* were discovered!

[39] K. A. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. Kap. 27.

The acquisition of Bavaria was regarded by Thugut as the paramount object of Austrian policy, and he had conceived a violent hatred of Prussia for having frustrated that object in the manner already related. This hatred being reciprocated by the Prussians had a pernicious effect on the relations between the two cabinets, and, according to the opinion of a recent German historian,[40] had more influence on the fatal separation which ensued between them than has been commonly supposed. The affairs of Prussia at this period were conducted by Haugwitz, a large landed proprietor of Silesia. In a journey which he made into Italy, Haugwitz acquired the favour of Leopold, then Grand Duke of Tuscany, and after the accession of that prince to the Imperial throne, and the change produced in Prussian policy by the Convention of Reichenbach, he was sent ambassador to Vienna. He subsequently entered the cabinet of Berlin as minister for foreign affairs. The fatal estrangement of Prussia from Austria, and from the affairs of the Empire, must be chiefly attributed to his policy. Another notable Prussian statesman of this period, though by birth a Hanoverian, was Baron Hardenberg, whose valuable memoirs of this period, published under the title of *Mémoires tirés des papiers d'un homme d'état*, we have so often had occasion to quote. When the Margraviates of Anspach and Baireuth were made over to Prussia in 1792 by Christian Frederick, the last Margrave, Hardenberg was, at his request, appointed by the King of Prussia to administer them. He was subsequently employed in several important negociations, and especially in those for the Treaty of Basle.

The affairs of Italy will not long detain us, though that country was destined to become before long the scene of events of the greatest moment. In general it may be observed, that although the French Revolution had of course its partisans in Italy, the great mass of the Italian people were not favourable to it. They entertained an ancient aversion to the French from their frequent attempts and well-known desire to establish their dominion in Italy.[41] It has been already related how the French compelled the King of Naples to acknowledge their Republic.[42] Naples was at that time the most considerable of the Italian Powers, and it will be proper to throw a retrospective glance upon its history.[43]

When Charles of Bourbon ascended the throne of Spain in 1759, the Two Sicilies were assigned, as we have already said, to his

[40] K. A. Menzel, B. vi. S. 313.
[41] Botta, t. i. p. 137.
[42] See above, p. 117.
[43] For these affairs see Carlo Botta, *Storia d'Italia dal* 1789 *al* 1814, libro i.; Colletta, *Storia di Napoli.*

second son, Ferdinand IV., then nine years of age. The Prince of St. Nicandro, appointed as his governor, was an uneducated man, addicted to the sports of the field, and capable only of instilling into the youthful monarch a love of his own pursuits. Fortunately, however, the Marquis Tanucci, a man of liberal and enlightened principles, possessed great influence in the Neapolitan counsels, and obtained the ear of the King. The main aims of Tanucci were to set bounds to the pretensions of the Pope, and to increase the royal prerogative by reducing the power of the nobles. In no part of Italy were feudal privileges more strictly maintained, or more oppressive, than in the Neapolitan dominions, and especially in the two Calabrias. The barons, like the *ci-devant* nobles of France, enjoyed exclusive rights of hunting and fishing, of grinding corn and baking bread; they named the judges and the governors of cities; besides the customary feudal services, they claimed the first fruits of the vintage, the harvest, and all the productions of agriculture and pasturage, as well as of custom dues, &c. Thus at one and the same time the people were oppressed, the royal authority was almost annihilated, and the treasury deprived of its proper revenues. Tanucci moderated all these abuses, and civilised the manners of the rustic nobles by summoning them to court. He also introduced many reforms into the relations between Naples and the Court of Rome. By his advice the tribunal of the Papal Nuncio was suppressed, and all appeals to Rome forbidden; the King asserted his right to nominate bishops, abbots, and other prelates; the presentation of a palfrey on St. Peter's day, the badge of feudal subjection to Rome, was converted into an eleemosynary offering; the coronation of the King was left uncelebrated, in order to avoid certain formalities customary since the times of the Norman kings, which indicated the sovereignty of the Holy See. The number of mendicant monks was reduced, and the order of the Jesuits suppressed. These reforms, of course, produced violent quarrels with the Court of Rome; the political disputes between Naples and that court had caused, indeed, the reform of ecclesiastical abuses to be prosecuted with greater ardour in the Neapolitan dominions than in Tuscany and Austrian Lombardy. Tanucci had also turned his attention to a reform in the laws, which formed an incongruous mixture derived from the Normans, Lombards, Aragonese, French, Spaniards, Austrians, the former conquerors and possessors of the country. But this was a work not so easily accomplished.

Thus Italy remained not uninfluenced by the liberal tendencies that marked the eighteenth century. The authority of the Papal

See had been also reduced in the Duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which were likewise governed by a branch of the Spanish Bourbons. The new opinions had not made so much progress in Ferdinand IV.'s kingdom of Sicily as in his Neapolitan dominions. The feudal system was still vigorous in that island towards the end of the eighteenth century. Sicily had from early times possessed a Parliament composed of three chambers, called *bracci*, or *arms*: namely, the military or baronial chamber, in which sat such *signori*, or lords, as had at least 300 *fuochi*, or dwellings, upon their properties; the ecclesiastical *braccio*, consisting of three archbishops, six bishops, and all the abbots; and the third chamber, called *demaniale*, because it consisted of the representatives of cities belonging to the King's *domain* and not under the dominion of the barons. For, as in Germany, there were two sorts of Sicilian cities, the *baronial* and the *free*. The last depended immediately on the King, and were governed by their own municipal laws. The baron of the oldest title was at the head of the *braccio baronale*; the Archbishop of Palermo of the *braccio ecclesiastico*, and the prætor, or mayor, of the same city of the *braccio demaniale*. In ancient times the Parliament met every year, but afterwards once in four years. It also lost its legislative functions, and was assembled only to vote donatives.

Tanucci was not so successful in his foreign as in his domestic policy. He was a partisan of France, and hence he incurred the displeasure of Ferdinand's Queen, the Austrian princess Caroline, a woman of imperious temper, sister of the Emperor Joseph II. and of Marie Antoinette. Tanucci was dismissed, and his place filled at first by the Marquis Sambuca, and then by Acton, the son of an Irish physician. The Neapolitans were indignant at seeing the arms of the French Republic affixed to the hotel of the French embassy, and in January 1793 a deputation of the citizens presented an address to King Ferdinand, supplicating him to declare war against France. It was easy to see that the neutrality of Naples could not long be preserved. On the 12th of July 1793 a treaty was concluded, as we have already said, between Sir W. Hamilton, the English minister at Naples, and Acton, Ferdinand's chief minister, by which Ferdinand engaged to unite to the British forces in the Mediterranean 6000 soldiers, four ships of the line, four frigates, and the same number of smaller vessels, Great Britain undertaking to maintain a respectable fleet in that sea, and to protect Neapolitan commerce.[44] The Neapolitans, as we have seen, subsequently took part in the occupation of Toulon.

[44] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 480.

The Papal throne was filled at the time of the French Revolution by Pius VI. His predecessor, Clement XIV. (Ganganelli), who had risen to the Papacy from the condition of a poor monk, had always retained the simple customs of his early life. These, however, seemed out of place in an age of inquiry, doubt, and disbelief; and it was thought that, when arguments cease to persuade and virtue to move by its example, the best substitutes for them are pomp, splendour, and magnificence. The Cardinals, therefore, on the death of Clement, in 1774, elected Cardinal Braschi (Pius VI.) as his successor. Braschi was handsome in person, eloquent of speech, refined in his tastes, of dignified manners, and a generous disposition. He had been treasurer to the apostolic *camera*, and had displayed in his demeanour and actions no ordinary splendour. All these good qualities, however, tended to a vicious extreme. He entertained a great opinion of himself as well as of his high dignity; he was arbitrary and disdainful, and could ill brook opposition. A scheme was agitated in his pontificate, originated by Cardinal Orsini, of uniting all Italy in a confederation, of which the Pope was to be the head. The chief glory of Pius VI. is the draining of the Pontine marshes, a work of extraordinary magnitude and labour.

Pius VI. was naturally shocked and offended by the novelties and innovations in matters of religion which accompanied the breaking out of the French Revolution. The respect with which he was treated by the Constituent Assembly soothed and appeased him for a time, but the excesses and blasphemies of the Legislative Assembly and of the Convention, and especially the loss of Avignon, impelled him to resort to his spiritual weapons. Hence the Emperor and the Italian princes of his party had little difficulty in persuading Pius to enter into an offensive league against France.

The situation of Tuscany induced the Grand Duke Ferdinand, though so nearly connected with the House of Austria, formally to recognise the French Republic, January 16th 1793, before the execution of Louis XVI. Tuscany preserved its neutrality till the following October, when the appearance of an English fleet in the Mediterranean encouraged Ferdinand to declare himself for the allies. Of the part taken in the war by Victor Amadeus III., King of Sardinia, we have already spoken. The Republic of Genoa, secretly inclined to France, maintained for a considerable time its neutrality, although summoned by the English and Spanish fleet, in October 1793, to change its policy. The port was now blockaded. Venice had also declared herself neutral. The Venetians, enervated by a long peace, and intent only on their

material interests, had sunk into an abyss of moral corruption and degradation. Expecting their safety only from the sufferance of their neighbours and the mutual jealousies of the great Powers, they had lost all public spirit and fallen into a sort of political quietism, which was carried so far that the Government actually forbade the representation of tragedies, as calculated to excite and elevate the soul! We are not, therefore, surprised to find that at the breaking out of the French Revolution they determined on the policy of doing nothing; and they persisted in their neutrality, though solicited by many Powers, Sardinia, Russia, Austria, Naples, to take a part against France. Yet their hatred of that country peeped out on all occasions. They sent back to the French minister the note of the Assembly acquainting them with the flight of the King to Varennes, because it did not bear Louis' signature; they refused to reply to the notice of the King's acceptance of the constitution; they suffered the Austrians to violate the neutrality they had declared by marching troops through their territories; in October 1792, when the allies were entering France, they authorised their subjects to supply the Emperor and the King of Sardinia with arms, provisions, and other necessaries; on the establishment of the French Republic they refused to acknowledge it, and though they at length consented to receive a *chargé d'affaires*, they would only recognise him with a puerile distinction as the minister of the French *nation* and not of the *republic*.[45] These and other grievances of the same kind, and especially the reception given to the Regent, under the title of Count de Lille, at Verona, towards the end of 1794, drew down upon the Venetian Republic the hatred and vengeance of the French, and served at least as pretexts for its destruction.

Respecting the Spanish peninsula, little need be added to what has been already said. Although Godoy was despised by every true Spaniard, yet Florida Blanca and d'Aranda had been successively compelled to give place to him; and in 1792 he obtained, with the title of Duke of Alcudia, the supreme direction of affairs. The war, however, which he commenced with France was at first popular. The Spaniards, devoted to the Church and to their King, beheld in the republicans of France the enemies of both. They contributed largely and spontaneously to the war; the feudal lords, as in ancient times, put themselves at the head of their vassals, the smugglers and even the monks formed regiments. But the enthusiasm of the nation was ill directed by

[45] See Daru, *Hist. de Venise*, liv. xxxvi.

Godoy; and the successes of the Spanish arms, already described, were soon followed by reverses that rendered the King anxious to conclude a peace.

The Portuguese had shared with the Spaniards in the French war, and are said to have formed the best portion of the Spanish army. The sceptre of Portugal had been held, since February 1777, by Queen Maria I., but her intellect having become disordered through religious melancholy, the regency was assumed by her son Don John, Prince of Brazil, in 1792. Don John was governed by his confessors, as other princes are by their favourites or mistresses; and he is said to have changed them as often.

CHAPTER VII.

We now return to the affairs of France. The *Parti Thermidorien*, having effected the fall of Robespierre, assumed, after that event, the conduct of affairs; and, in a few days, sent upwards of eighty of Robespierre's friends and accomplices to the *guillotine*. As these were, for the most part, members of the *Commune*, the influence of that body was completely destroyed. The Government was still conducted by the two committees, but they were reorganised. Barère, Billaud Varennes, and Collot d'Herbois resigned, September 1st 1794. Barère had sat in the Committee of Public Welfare ever since its institution in April 1793. He was a small poet, and seasoned his exterminating reports with a certain wit, and even hilarity, whence Burke called him the Anacreon of the *guillotine*.[1] Wholesale slaughter was arrested; though Lebon, David the painter, and a few other terrorists, but not perhaps the worst among them, were executed. The *guillotine*, by being overworked, had lost its former terrors, and, according to the remark of a recent historian, had become only wearisome.[2] Numbers of prisoners were released; Robespierre's horrible law of the 22nd *Prairial* was abolished; trials were conducted with more care and moderation. The daily assemblies of the sections were reduced to one in each *decade*; and the pay of forty sous a-day to the indigent members who attended was stopped.

Matters were thus far tending to a counter-revolution. A party began to be formed among the middling and richer classes, which, from its being chiefly composed of young men, obtained the name of *La jeunesse dorée* (the *gilded youth*); or *La jeunesse dorée de Fréron*, from its being patronised by that demagogue. The *Jeunesse dorée* adopted a peculiar dress, called *costume à la victime*, consisting of a short coat without a collar, low shoes, enormous green cravats; the hair, hanging low at the front and sides, was tressed up behind; a short stick, loaded with lead, served at once as a weapon and a badge. Even the women

[1] Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 282.
[2] "Elle ennuyait." L. Blanc, t. xi. p. 276.

affected a peculiar costume called *bonnets d'humanité* and *corsets à la justice*. Persons of this party saluted one another with a gesture that resembled the falling of the head into the basket.[3] Some of them were Royalists; others only followed the impulse for restoring order. The fashionable saloons began again to be frequented. Madame de Staël reappeared in the Parisian circles. Madame Recamier and Madame Tallien, two beautiful women, were the chief leaders of fashion. The loose apparel of Hébert's Goddess of Reason still formed a model, and women of *bon ton* appeared in the semi-nudity of Greek and Roman courtezans.

The Jacobin Club, though deprived of its chief leaders, still showed signs of vitality. They and the *Jeunesse dorée* were at open war; and they frequently attacked one another in the streets with cries of *Vive la Convention! Vive la Montagne!* But on the evening of November 8th 1794 the *Jeunesse dorée*, armed with sticks, stones, and other weapons, broke into the Hall of the Jacobins and drove out the members; and shortly after the club was put down by the Government.

The counter-revolution now proceeded with rapid strides. On December 8th, the seventy-three deputies, who had protested against the arrest of the Girondists, were readmitted into the Convention. Before the close of 1794, the decrees for the banishment of priests and nobles, and for putting English and Hanoverian prisoners to death, were reversed: divine worship was restored, the *maximum* suppressed. The effects of the *maximum* were now cruelly displayed. The scarcity had become so terrible that it became necessary to fix the daily consumption of bread of each inhabitant of Paris.[4] The proscription of the higher class had aggravated the crisis by lessening the demand for labour. Specie was hoarded, while the value of the *assignat* fell so rapidly that it became hardly passable. We hear of 24,000 livres paid for a load of fire-wood, 6000 for the fare of a hackney coachman![5] Dealers at length refused to take them in payment; yet their nominal value was still maintained by law, and many a debtor discharged his obligations with this imaginary money. *Assignats* were bought up at a mere trifle, in order to purchase with them national property. Thus the State also suffered, but more justly than individuals.

On the report of a Committee of the Convention, Billaud Varennes, Collot d'Herbois, Barère, and Vadier were arrested, tried, and sentenced to deportation, April 1st 1795. Carrier, the

[3] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvi. p. 408.
[4] Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 314.
[5] L. Blanc, t. xi. p. 416.

sanguinary monster of Nantes, had been executed in December. Fouquier Tinville, the *ci-devant* Public Accuser, and fifteen judges of the Revolutionary Tribunal, were, after a trial of forty-one days, condemned and executed on the Place de Grève, May 7th. On the condemnation of Billaud and his associates, an attempt at insurrection was made; but such was the altered state of public feeling, that the Convention, not the insurgents, caused the *tocsin* to be rung, to summon the well-disposed sections to their aid. The successful attack on the Hôtel de Ville on the 9th *Thermidor* had inspired the reactionary party with confidence, and they had, moreover, the advantage of military skill, their movements being directed by Pichegru and Barras. Collot d' Herbois, Billaud Varennes, and Barère were conducted to Rochefort for transportation without any effectual attempt at resistance on the part of the mob. The escape of Barère was connived at, and he was permitted to live quietly in his department of the Hautes Pyrénées. Vadier had also contrived to escape.

The ultra-democratic party was still further weakened by the arrest of nine of the most violent of the *Crête*, or remains of the *Montagne* (April 5th). The last and most violent attempt at insurrection was made at the commencement of *Prairial* (May 20th, 21st, 1795). A mob from the faubourgs of St. Antoine and St. Marceau, taking for their watchword "Bread and the constitution of 1793," broke into the Convention, and levelled their muskets at the members. Féraud, a deputy, was shot, his head cut off, and brought into the Assembly on a pike. It was not till after many hours of uproar and disturbance that the national guards succeeded, about midnight, in clearing the hall at the point of the bayonet. On the following morning the attempt was renewed. Cannons were planted on the *Place du Carrousel*, and the most terrible extremities were apprehended. But after some parley, the mob retired, on receiving an assurance that the Convention would provide a supply of corn, and that the organic laws of the constitution of '93 should be presented for discussion. The Convention now proceeded to decree the arrest and trial of several members of the *Montagne*, including Panis and Sergent, for having signed the famous circular of September 2nd 1792.[6]

On the 23rd of May an army of 30,000 men, raised from the orderly sections, under the command of Menou, marched upon the faubourg St. Antoine, and compelled the inhabitants to surrender their cannon and small arms. Other doubtful sections

[6] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvi. p. 351 sqq.

were treated in a similar manner; and all citizens were called upon to give up their pikes and other non-military weapons, so that only the richer classes retained their arms.[7] The national guard was reorganised on pretence of relieving indigent citizens from the duty of mounting guard. A camp was formed in the Tuileries gardens; and a strong garrison of troops of the line was introduced into Paris. A military commission condemned to death many of the rioters, including six members of the Convention. By death, transportation, imprisonment, or flight, the *Montagne* lost sixty-two of its adherents.[8] The abolishment of the sections, by the division of Paris into twelve *arrondissements* or municipalities, was also a severe blow to faction. These, however, though decreed in February 1795, were not finally established till the following February.[9] The Revolutionary Tribunal was finally suppressed, May 31st 1795.[10]

By these measures, the counter-revolution was established at Paris, and it could not be doubtful that the provinces would follow. The reaction, conducted at first by moderate republicans, fell more and more into the hands of the reactionists and royalists. The emigrants and priests had returned in great numbers, and many new journals were established in the counter-revolutionary interest. It was in the provinces, and especially in the South, that the reaction was most violent, and accompanied with murders and massacres which have obtained for it the name of the *Terreur Blanche*. These execrable deeds have afforded ultra-democratic writers arguments for justifying, or, at all events, extenuating, the *Terreur Rouge*.[11] Bands of assassins were organised under the names of *Compagnies de Jésus*, or *Jéhu*, and *Compagnies du Soleil*, among the leaders of which were Isnard and other Girondists. The massacres perpetrated by the proconsuls were now retaliated at Lyon, Toulon, Marseilles, Tarascon, Nimes, and other places. At Lyon a system of assassination began soon after the 9th *Thermidor*. On May 5th 1795 a wholesale massacre took place there; ninety-seven persons were put to death in the prisons; those who had escaped were hunted down like wild beasts, killed, and flung into the Rhone. At Tarascon the victims were precipitated from a high tower. Almost all the towns of the South had their September 2nd; yet the Convention remained passive spectators of these atrocities.[12]

[7] Blanc, t. xii. p. 172 sqq.
[8] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvi. p. 383 sqq.
[9] Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 313, 340.
[10] *Ibid.* p. 334.
[11] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvi. p. 407; L. Blanc, t. xii. *La Terreur Blanche.*
[12] For details of the *Terreur Blanche*, see *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvi. pp. 405–484;

In order to obtain a connected view of the progress of the French Revolution, we have hitherto abstained from noticing the military operations during the years 1794 and 1795, of which we must now give a brief summary.

In 1794, the French had nominally thirteen armies on foot, forming an effective force of between 600,000 and 700,000 men,[13] now inured to discipline, and animated with the confidence of success. On the other hand, the disastrous issue of the campaign of 1793, and the mutual reproaches of the Duke of Brunswick and Wurmser, had sown dissension between the Austrians and Prussians. The Duke had resigned the command in a letter addressed to Prince Louis of Prussia, January 24th 1794,[14] and had been succeeded by Marshal Möllendorf. The Austrian and Prussian Cabinets seemed almost to have abandoned the hope that it would be possible to alter the French Government by force of arms. Thugut even made some indirect overtures for peace to the Committee of Public Welfare, which were haughtily rejected.[15] On the other hand, Pitt, backed by Russia, endeavoured to reanimate the Coalition, and persuaded the Emperor to increase his forces, and to put himself at their head. Mack was despatched to London with a plan for a vigorous campaign. But the King of Prussia pleaded poverty; directed Möllendorf to retire his forces by degrees towards Cologne; threatened that he would only furnish his contingent as a prince of the Empire, amounting to some 20,000 men. His attention, in fact, was engrossed by the affairs of Poland, where, as we have already related, an insurrection had broken out. He consented, however, to be subsidised. By the Treaty of the Hague with England and Holland, April 19th 1794, he agreed to furnish 62,000 men, on receiving immediately 300,000*l.* sterling, 50,000*l.* monthly during the war, 100,000*l.* for the return of the troops, and 1*l.* 12*s.* monthly per man for their subsistence. The conquests made by his troops were to be assigned to the maritime Powers.[16]

At the opening of the campaign the allies were posted as follows. The English, Dutch, and Austrians, about 160,000 men, occupied a line extending from Ypres to Trèves. The Prussians, in considerably less numbers than were paid for, were posted on the Hundsrück on the left bank of the Rhine, between Trèves and Mentz. The army of the Empire, about 20,000 men, extended

Fréron, *Mém. Historique sur la réaction royale et les massacres du midi*; Blanc, *loc. cit.*

[13] *Archives du Ministère de la Guerre*, in *Hist. Parl.*, t. xxxiii. p. 271. It seems probable, however, that not nearly this force was ever actually in the field.

[14] *Homme d'état*, t. ii. p. 447.

[15] *Ibid.* p. 455 sqq.

[16] Martens, *Recueil*, t. v. p. 610.

along the Rhine, between Basle and Heidelberg. Opposed to these, from Dunkirk to Maubeuge, was the army of the North under Pichegru; to the east of that, between Givet and Sedan, the army of the Ardennes under Charbonnier; between the Moselle and the Saar, Jourdan with the army of the Moselle. Michaud, with the army of the Rhine, was opposed to the Prussians and Imperialists.[17] Moreau served under Pichegru, Kleber under Charbonnier. The French generals were stimulated by the presence of the proconsuls St. Just, Lebas, Levasseur, and others. The Duke of York, who was at the head of about 40,000 British and Hanoverian troops, having refused to serve under Clairfait, the commander of the Austrian right, the Emperor was obliged to come in person and assume the nominal command. He arrived at Brussels, April 4th, on pretext of being inaugurated Duke of Brabant.[18]

Mack's plan of the campaign was to take Landrecies and march upon Paris by Laon and Guise, covering his right flank by inundating West Flanders, his left, by an advance of the Prussians. Prince Coburg, having driven the French from their entrenched camp at Landrecies, April 17th, the siege of that place was formed by the Prince of Orange. With the view of saving it, the French made an attack along the whole line, April 26th. At Cateau Cambrésis, or the redoubts of Troisville, they were defeated by the Duke of York, and driven back to Cambrai with a loss of thirty-seven guns. On the other hand, Jourdan was successful against Beaulieu at Arlon, and Pichegru in West Flanders against Clairfait. Menin was now threatened by Pichegru; Clairfait hastened to its aid, but was defeated at Moucron, April 29th, and Menin fell into the hands of the French. Ypres, the centre of the allies, was now threatened, and the Duke of York was compelled to retreat to Tournay.

Mack still persisted in his plan of marching upon Paris, in which he was encouraged by the Emperor. But Thugut, who had accompanied Francis into Belgium, and also what was called the Austrian party, that is, the statesmen who conceived that it would be better for the interests of Austria to relinquish the war against France, and even the defence of the Belgian provinces, and to seek compensation on the side of Poland or Bavaria, were opposed to Mack's undertaking. Coburg did not move; the Flemings objected to

[17] The archives of the French ministry of war state the total force of these armies at 368,740 men (*Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii. p. 271). But Marshal Jourdan, in a MS. quoted by Blanc (t. xi. p. 13), places them only at 284,000.

[18] *Ann. Register*, vol. xxxix. ch. i. p. 12 sq.

inundate their country; Möllendorf could not be persuaded to march towards the Sambre.

The allies had formed a plan to cut the French line by attacking their camp at Courtrai, thus separating their left wing from Lille and the French frontier, and compelling them to fight with the sea at their back. To assure their communications with Lille, Souham and Moreau marched upon Tourcoign, and defeated the allies (May 18th). The Duke of York saved himself only by the swiftness of his horse. After an interval of four days, Pichegru made another attack at Pont-à-chin, where the Emperor commanded in person. The battle had lasted ten hours, when the fortune of the day was retrieved by some troops detached by the Duke of York, and especially by the decisive charge of a brigade of British infantry. The Reign of Terror, it will be remembered, was now in full vigour: Barère, in a rambling tirade against the English, resembling rather the ravings of a madman than the speech of a statesman,[19] proposed a decree that henceforth all English or Hanoverians should be put to death without quarter. The decree was unanimously adopted, and ordered to be sent to the representatives of the people at the armies: but the French generals had too much humanity to carry it into execution. The Duke of York replied by an order of the day, in which he exhorted his troops to confine their abhorrence to the National Convention, and to treat the vanquished French with the same humanity as before.

The efforts of the French were chiefly directed to the capture of Charleroi, the key of the allied position. After several repulses, they succeeded in establishing themselves beyond the Sambre, and laid siege to that town. It was during this siege that St. Just caused an officer of artillery to be shot, for having negligently constructed a battery. To Jourdan, who had refused to detach to the aid of Pichegru some troops that he deemed better employed before Charleroi, he observed: "Very well; but mind, if Pichegru is beaten, your head falls!"[20] While such were the stimulants applied to the French generals, those of Austria were purposely discouraged by the policy of their Government. In a council of war held at Tournay, May 24th, in which the opinions of Thugut and Coburg prevailed, the campaign was represented as lost, through the French having established themselves in West Flanders; it was therefore proposed to evacuate the Netherlands,

[19] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxiii. p. 101–127. He ascribed the origin of the English to the Phœnicians and Carthaginians, and attempted to show all their history, down to modern times, stained by their barbarous descent!

[20] L. Blanc, t. xi. p. 27 sq.

and to obtain a share of Poland. In compliance with these views, the Emperor, as already related in the preceding chapter, quitted Belgium for Vienna, June 9th. The fate of the Belgic provinces was now politically determined; and the military movements of the commander-in-chief had henceforth no other object than to bring about their abandonment, without too plainly discovering that motive. Coburg wasted his time in marches and counter-marches between the Lys and the Sambre, and left Clairfait to fight without reinforcements, although there were 30,000 Austrians unemployed at Tournay. The fruits of this conduct soon became apparent. Ypres surrendered to the army of Pichegru, June 17th. The allies were thus outflanked on the side of Flanders, and the road to Ostend opened to the French. On the other side, Jourdan effected a fourth passage of the Sambre, and came with all his forces to cover the siege of Charleroi. Prince Coburg delayed to march against him till it was too late. Charleroi had already fallen the preceding day, when Coburg, who is supposed to have been acquainted with its surrender, attacked Jourdan at Fleurus, June 26th. The Austrians, who had rather the advantage in numbers, are thought to have been purposely defeated. Prince Coburg still occupied a strong position between Nivelles and Braine-le-Comte, yet he dissembled not his intention of abandoning Belgium. The Prince of Orange and Marquis Cornwallis represented to him, in vain, that such a movement would insure the conquest of Holland by the French: he declared that it was impossible to resist the armies of the Convention; that his communications with the Rhine were threatened; that he must shelter himself behind the Meuse. Summoning Clairfait to join him, and thus leaving the English and Dutch to take care of themselves, he retreated by Tirlemont upon Liége, and crossed the Meuse at Maestricht. Jourdan, who was pursuing him, received instructions from the French Government to halt upon that river, till the four towns captured by the allies should be recovered; a sort of armistice ensued; and negociations were entered into, which, however, had no result. The English Government, alarmed by the retreat of the Austrians, despatched Earl Spencer and Mr. Thos. Grenville to Vienna, to sound the intentions of the Emperor, to offer a subsidy, and to procure the dismissal of Prince Coburg, who was justly regarded as having chiefly caused the failure of the campaign. The English envoys, accompanied by M. Fagel, *greffier* of the States-General, visited on their way the quarters of Prince Coburg, at Fauron-le-Comte. They found him preparing to abandon Maestricht, and retreat beyond the Rhine; and it was

only after some warm conferences that, with the aid of Prince Metternich, they persuaded him to remain. Arrived at Vienna, Earl Spencer succeeded in obtaining the recall of Prince Coburg, who resigned the command-in-chief of the Imperial army to General Clairfait, August 28th.[21] Although it is believed that one motive for the retreat of the Austrians was to alarm the English Cabinet, and draw from it subsidies in turn, yet as Lord Spencer's offer of three millions was only conditional, the Cabinet of Vienna declined the immediate resumption of hostilities. But it consented that 25,000 Austrians, under General Alvinzi, should pass into the Anglo-Batavian service and pay, and should assist the Duke of York's army in the defence of Holland.[22]

After the retreat of Prince Coburg, most of the Belgian towns fell one after another into the hands of the French. Pichegru took Mechlin, July 15th, and compelled the English and Dutch to retreat on Antwerp and Breda. Schérer was directed to reduce Landrecies, Le Quesnoy, Valenciennes and Condé, which still remained in the hands of the allies. Barère obtained a decree (July 4th), that if the garrisons of these places did not surrender within twenty-four hours after being summoned, they should be put to the sword.[23] Schérer, however, by Jourdan's directions, to save the commandant of Landrecies from the disgrace of a hasty surrender, did not send the summons till strong batteries had been erected. The commandant of Le Quesnoy, asserting that no nation had a right to decree the dishonour of another, held out for several days; yet the decree was not executed. The four towns were recaptured in the course of July and August. Towards the end of the latter month, Moreau, with a division of the army of the North, took Nieuport and Sluys. In Nieuport were 500 French emigrants, and 200 English; the emigrants were shot, but Choudieu, the national representative, to whom Moreau referred the matter, abstained from carrying out the decree of no quarter against the English.[24]

The Prussians proved as treacherous allies as the Austrians, and from baser motives; they condescended to accept the pay, but were too proud to perform the duties, of mercenaries.[25] In vain the English and Dutch ambassadors endeavoured to persuade Möllendorf to march towards the Sambre, in other words, to assist

[21] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. pp. 42, 69.
[22] *Ibid.* pp. 81, 86.
[23] *Hist. Parl.*, t. xxxiii. p. 326.
[24] *Ibid.* p. 310.
[25] "Il (Fréd.-Guillaume II), arracha à l'Angleterre, sous prétexte de faire la guerre à la France, soixante millions de florins, qui facilitèrent ses acquisitions en Pologne." *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 202.

those whose pay he was receiving; the Marshal had formed his own idea of the campaign, and refused to abandon his position for fear of exposing Mentz. We shall not detail the military operations in this quarter, which were unimportant. Möllendorf advanced in May, though not in the direction required by the allies, gained a victory at Kaiserslautern, and drove the French beyond the Queich. But no results followed. Möllendorf was too late in his attempts to save Trèves, which fell into the hands of the French, August 9th. The Duke of Saxe Teschen gained at first some successes over the French. In the middle of September, Frederick William II. notified to the Court of Vienna that he wanted troops in Poland, and must withdraw those on the Rhine. Möllendorf, accordingly, crossed that river, October 20th and 21st, and the corps of Prince Hohenlohe marched into Poland. The Austrians had recrossed the Rhine two or three weeks before. Jourdan had resumed the offensive against Clairfait, in the middle of September, and compelled him to retreat upon the Roer. But he was driven from his position on that river, at Aldenhoven, near Juliers, October 2nd, and effected his passage over the Rhine on the 5th, at Bonn, Cologne, and Düsseldorf. After the retreat of the allies, the French entered Cologne October 6th, Coblenz 23rd. Kleber, after an attempt to take Mentz by a *coup de main*, found it necessary to begin a regular siege. This was the last feat of arms of the Prussians, who now withdrew entirely from the Rhine, leaving the defence of Mentz to the Austrians. At the end of the year, this town alone, on the left bank of the Rhine, remained in the hands of the Coalition, though the Austrians still held Luxembourg.

The French arms were equally successful on the side of Holland. Pichegru, having taken Bois le Duc, October 9th, the Duke of York retreated to the Ar, and thence beyond the Waal. Venloo fell October 27th, Maestricht November 4th, and the capture of Nimeguen on the 9th, which the English abandoned after the fall of Maestricht, opened to the French the road into Holland. The Duke of York resigned the command to General Walmoden, December 2nd, and returned into England. His departure showed that the English Government had abandoned all hope of saving Holland. It had, indeed, consented that the States-General should propose terms of accommodation to the French; and two Dutch envoys had been despatched to Paris to offer to the Committee of Public Welfare the recognition by their Government of the French Republic, and the payment of 200,000,000 florins within a year. But the Committee, suspecting that these offers were made only

with the view of gaining time, paid no attention to them.[26] The French were repulsed in their first attempt to cross the Waal by General Duncan with 8000 English; but a severe frost enabled them to pass over on the ice, January 11th 1795. Nothing but a victory could now save Holland. But Walmoden, instead of concentrating his troops for the purpose of giving battle, retreated over the Yssel, and finally over the Ems into Westphalia, whence the troops were carried to England by sea from Bremen. During this long and difficult march in the depth of a most rigorous winter, without tents and exposed to all sorts of hardships and privations, the English displayed unflinching courage and perseverance. General Alvinzi, who held the Rhine between Emmerich and Arnheim, having retired upon Wesel, Pichegru had only to advance. On entering Holland, he called upon the patriots to rise, and his occupation of the Dutch towns was immediately followed by a revolution. The Prince of Orange, the hereditary Stadtholder, embarked for England, January 19th, on which day Pichegru's advanced columns entered Amsterdam. Next day the Dutch fleet, frozen up in the Texel, was captured by the French hussars. Before the end of January the reduction of Holland had been completed, and a provincial government established at the Hague.

The States-General, assembled February 24th 1795, having received, through French influence, a new infusion of the patriot party, pronounced the abolition of the Stadtholderate, proclaimed the sovereignty of the people and the establishment of the Batavian Republic. A Treaty of Peace with France followed, May 16th, and an offensive alliance against all enemies whatsoever till the end of the war, and against England for ever. The sea and land forces to be provided by the Dutch were to serve under French commanders. Thus the new republic became a mere dependency of France. Dutch Flanders, the district on the left bank of the Hondt, Maestricht, Venloo were retained by the French as a just indemnity for the expenses of the war, on which account the Dutch were also to pay 100,000,000 florins; but they were to receive, at the general peace, an equivalent for the ceded territories. By secret articles, the Dutch were to lend the French seven ships of war, to support a French army of 25,000 men, &c.[27] Over and above the requisitions of the treaty, they were also called upon to reclothe the French troops and to furnish them with provisions. In short, though the Dutch patriots had *fraternised* with the

[26] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 121 sq.
[27] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 88; Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 250 sqq.

French, and received them with open arms, they were treated little better than a conquered people.

Secret negociations had been for some time going on between France and Prussia for a peace. In spite of the family connection between the Houses of Brandenburg and Orange, Haugwitz had confidentially informed the Committee of Public Welfare that a revolution in Holland, and the abolition of the Stadtholderate, would form no bar to a treaty.[28] Frederick William II. had returned to Potsdam after his retreat from Warsaw in a very ill humour, and had manifested a strong desire to break with the Coalition, in which he was encouraged by Haugwitz and his cabinet. Satisfied with his acquisitions in Poland, to which the English and Dutch subsidies had helped him, he abandoned himself to his voluptuous habits, forgetful of his projects and his reverses, the dangers of the Empire, the cause of legitimate monarchy, and the interests of his sister, the Princess of Orange. The changes in the French Government, after the overthrow of Robespierre, seemed to permit of overtures being made to it without too much disgrace. But perhaps not the least influential among Frederick William's motives, was the refusal of the maritime Powers any longer to subsidise him for doing nothing. The French, on their side, were not unwilling to dissipate the Coalition by means of separate treaties, and after some indirect overtures through the ministers of the two Powers in Switzerland, conferences were opened at Basle in January 1795. The Prussian provinces on the left bank of the Rhine formed the chief difficulty of the negociations. The French asserted their ancient pretensions to have that river for a boundary; while Frederick William, whose armies were still intact, could not consent to that sacrifice. The difficulty was obviated by adjourning, till a general pacification, the fate of those provinces. But such an arrangement implied that Prussia was then to obtain an equivalent for them out of conquests to be made by France; or, in other words, that she was to indemnify herself at the expense of neighbouring German Powers; and such an indemnification was, in fact, stipulated in the secret articles.[29] The Peace of Basle, between the French Republic and the King of Prussia, was signed April 5th 1795.[30] The French troops were allowed to continue the occupation of the Rhenish provinces on the left bank. An article, that neither party should

[28] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 118.

[29] *Ibid.* p. 146.

[30] Martens, t. vi. p. 45. Neither Martens nor Garden gives the secret articles, though the latter thinks it probable that there were some (t. v. p. 287). They will be found in Hardenberg's *Mém. d'un homme d'état*, loc. cit. Hardenberg negociated the treaty.

permit troops of the enemies of either to pass over its territories, was calculated to embarrass the Austrians. France agreed to accept the mediation of Prussia for princes of the Empire. The more important secret articles, besides that already mentioned, were, that Prussia should engage in no hostile enterprise against Holland, or any other country occupied by French troops; while the French agreed not to push their enterprises in Germany beyond a certain line of demarcation, including the Circles of Westphalia, Higher and Lower Saxony, Franconia, and that part of the two Circles of the Rhine situate on the right bank of the Main. This line was established by a subsequent treaty, dated May 17th,[31] by which France agreed to respect the neutrality of the districts specified, on condition that they should recall their contingents from the Imperial army, and furnish no more troops to Powers at war with France. This offer of mediation on the part of Prussia was an ambitious plan to acquire an undue influence in the Empire, and an unconstitutional breach of the German Confederation.

Thus the King of Prussia, originally the most ardent promoter of the Coalition, was one of the first to desert it. By signing the Peace of Basle, he sacrificed Holland, facilitated the invasion of the Empire by the French, and thus prepared the ruin of the ancient German constitution; he struck a blow at his own reputation and the renown of the Prussian arms; and laid the foundation of that system of false policy which ten years later proved fatal to his own dominions.

The occupation of the left bank of the Rhine, the conquest of the Austrian Netherlands, the establishment of the Batavian Republic as a humble ally of France, the detachment of Prussia from the Coalition, were among the most surprising and important consequences of the campaign of 1794, which had begun under such disheartening prospects for France. The operations of the French armies in other quarters during that year were also ultimately attended with success, though with less important results. At first the French were beaten back both in the eastern and western Pyrenees, and compelled to retreat to Perpignan on one side and Bayonne on the other. But in the east, Dugommier at length turned the tide of war; retook Bellegarde in September, the last position held by the Spaniards in France, and by the battle of the Montagne Noire, which lasted from November 17th to the 20th, opened the way into Catalonia. But at the beginning of this battle

[31] Martens, t. vi. p. 52.

Dugommier was killed. Figuières surrendered November 24th, through the influence of the French democratic propaganda. On the west, Moncey captured St. Sebastian and Fuentarabia in August, and was preparing to attack Pampeluna, when terrible storms, which rendered it impossible to transport the sick and provisions, compelled him to retreat on the Bidassoa, and closed the campaign in that quarter.

On the side of Piedmont, the French, after some reverses, succeeded in making themselves masters of Mont Cenis and the passes of the Maritime Alps, thus holding the keys of Italy; but the Government, content with this success, ventured not at present to undertake the invasion of that country. The King of Sardinia had signed the Treaty of Valenziana with Austria, May 23rd 1794, by which the Emperor agreed to support the Piedmontese with an additional body of troops under the command of General de Vins. Victor Amadeus remained true to this engagement, although the French Government, in conformity with their policy of breaking up the Coalition by separate peaces, endeavoured to detach him from the Austrian alliance, by offering to guarantee his dominions if he would declare himself neuter, and allow the French a passage; or, if he would make common cause with France, the possession of the Milanese, and the exchange of the Island of Sardinia for territories more conveniently situated.[32] With the Grand Duke of Tuscany they were more successful. Alarmed at their occupation of the Alps, this prince sent Count Carletti to Paris to negociate a peace. On February 9th 1795, a treaty was signed by which the Grand Duke revoked his adhesion to the Coalition; and the neutrality of Tuscany was placed on the same footing as previously to October 8th 1793.[33] Thus Ferdinand was the first to desert the Emperor, his brother. The example of Tuscany was followed by the Regent of Sweden, who despatched the Baron de Staël to Paris in the name of his nephew, to assure the Convention of his sovereign's friendship for the French Republic. But these advances were without result, the French having neglected to subsidise the Swedes, and thus enable them to maintain a fleet which should make their neutrality respected by England.[34]

But although the arms and the policy of France were thus successful on the continent, she could not boast of the same good fortune where matters depended on maritime operations. Hence her loss of Corsica. An insurrection, fomented by General Paoli, had broken out in that island early in 1793; the Corsicans, except

[32] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 296.
[33] Martens, t. vi. p. 5; Botta, t. i. lib. iv. v.
[34] Ségur, t. iii. p 219.

in the towns of Bastia, San Fiorenzo, and Calvi, which were garrisoned by the French, refused to acknowledge the National Convention, withdrew their deputies from that assembly, established a new government or consulta-generale, named Paoli generalissimo. The war that broke out between France and England was favourable to the Corsican revolution. With the aid of the English fleet, which now rode triumphant in the Mediterranean, the three towns held by the French were successively reduced in the course of 1794; Calvi, the last which held out, surrendered August 4th. It was in these operations that Nelson first distinguished himself; at Calvi he lost an eye. A general assembly convoked at Corte, after the fall of Bastia, and presided over by Paoli, voted the annexation of Corsica to Great Britain, June 19th, and drew up a constitution modelled on that of England.

The year 1794 was also marked by Lord Howe's memorable victory over the French fleet under Villaret Joyeuse off Ushant, June 1st, and by several English conquests in the West Indies. Admiral Sir John Jarvis and a land force captured Martinique in March, St. Lucie and Guadaloupe and its dependent isles in April; but the last-named conquest was not long retained. The reduction of St. Domingo, begun in the previous year, was also effected by Admiral Ford and General White.

In Europe, France hardly sustained in the following year the brilliant position achieved by her by the campaign of 1794. All parties seemed desirous of repose, and the strife was not renewed on the German frontier till towards the approach of autumn. The inactivity of the French armies was occasioned as well by the distress, almost the disorganisation, in which they were plunged, as by the crisis in the revolutionary government. Hence negociations rather than feats of arms occupied the year 1795; but these also turned to the advantage of the French. The Emperor, naturally alarmed and irritated by the defection of Prussia, hesitated as to what course he should pursue. Several of the German States sent ministers to Basle, and Francis, thus threatened with desertion by the Confederation, addressed a note to the Diet, requiring the various States of the Empire to declare, categorically and individually, whether they meant to adhere to the constitution, or to conclude partial arrangements through Prussian mediation; adding that he should take such measures as the interests of the Empire, as well as those of his own dominions, might dictate. He declared himself prepared to procure for the Empire a solid peace at the earliest possible period, and trusted that the States would not be enticed by insidious baits to make partial and momentary accom-

modations, in which the sole object of the enemy was the destruction of the German constitution.[35] At the same time he notified to several courts his inclinations to make peace with France, but not without the concurrence of his allies, especially England and the German Empire. The English Cabinet, however, was for continuing the war; with which view it entered into some fresh treaties with Austria. By that concluded May 4th 1795, they undertook to guarantee a loan of 4,600,000*l.* to be raised by the Emperor in England, on condition of his maintaining on foot, for the campaign of that year, an army of 200,000 men, with which English commissaries were to be present.[36] This treaty was followed by a defensive alliance concluded between Austria and Great Britain, May 29th. By a separate article, the Empress of Russia was to be invited to form with the two contracting Powers a triple alliance, in order to maintain the future peace of Europe; which alliance was eventually concluded at St. Petersburg, September 28th. The Russian treaty has not been published; but it is known that Catherine engaged to furnish either 30,000 men or a certain sum of money, and that subsidies were actually paid to the Emperor.[37] A defensive alliance had been previously concluded, February 18th 1795, between Great Britain and Russia;[38] in consequence of which a Russian fleet joined that of England in the summer of that year, and, in conjunction with Admiral Duncan, cruised off the coasts of Holland till the autumn of 1796.

The Diet of Ratisbon, by a *conclusum* of July 3rd, expressed its desire that the Emperor should take steps for a pacification with France, and that the mediation of the King of Prussia should be employed for that purpose. Although this last condition was very disagreeable to Francis, yet he ratified the *conclusum* of the Diet. He took, however, no active steps in the matter, but left it in the hands of the King of Prussia, who had accepted the office of mediator. Baron Hardenberg was accordingly again despatched to Basle; but the French Government refused to enter into negociations. Another attempt to negociate a peace between the Emperor and the French Republic through the mediation of Denmark proved equally unsuccessful. The Committee of Public Welfare would neither agree to a Congress at Augsburg, nor to a suspension of arms, as proposed in Count Bernstorff's note of August 18th.[39] It plainly appeared that the Committee wished not to make a peace with the Empire, as a confederate body, but to detach

[35] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 173.
[36] Martens, t. vi. p. 65.
[37] Garden, t. v. p. 300.
[38] Martens, t. vi. p. 11.; Garden, t. v. p. 298.
[39] Garden, t. v. p. 294.

the principal members of it, and thus entirely to isolate Austria. In this object they partially succeeded. The Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, who had been one of the most active of the German princes against the common enemy, made a separate treaty with France at Basle, August 28th, and agreed to renounce his treaty of subsidies with England.[40] After the resumption of hostilities in September, and the passage of the Rhine by the French, the Elector Palatine, to save his town of Mannheim, entered into a secret convention of neutrality with Pichegru. The Duke of Würtemberg also obtained a suspension of arms from the French commanders, but the Convention refused to ratify it.[41] The French Government, however, assented, during the negociations at Basle, to a proposal of the Emperor's for the exchange of *Madame*, daughter of Louis XVI., who was still immured in the Temple, against Camus, and the other Conventionals arrested by Dumouriez, and two or three other persons, including Drouet, the noted postmaster of St. Menehould, who had fallen into the hands of the Austrians. The matter was, however, delayed because the Court of Vienna refused to recognise the French Republic by signing a convention with it, and the arrangement was eventually carried out through the intervention of the Danish Government. The exchange was effected at Rhiechen, near Basle, December 26th. The young princess was ignorant at the time of her liberation of the deaths of her mother, her aunt, and her brother!

The death of this young prince in the Temple, June 8th, at the age of ten, is supposed to have been accelerated, if not occasioned, by ill-treatment and want of air and exercise.[42] It facilitated another triumph of French diplomacy, a peace with Charles IV. of Spain. Negociations for this purpose had been entered into towards the end of 1794; but they had hitherto been fruitless because the Spanish monarch made it a point of honour to demand not only the liberation of Louis XVII., but also his installation as King in the bordering provinces of Spain. Jealousy of England is said to have been another motive in the counsels of Spain; and the tergiversation of Prussia had supplied a precedent. It is doubtful whether the conclusion of the treaty was hastened by the success of the French arms. This had not, indeed, been very marked on the side of Catalonia, where, though several bloody battles had been fought, the only signal triumph of the French was

[40] Martens, t. vi. p. 130.

[41] *Ibid.* p. 263; Garden, t. v. p. 302.

[42] It has been suspected that the Simons contrived the escape of the young king by substituting for him a dumb child. Hence he was subsequently personated by several impostors. The whole story is a mystery. See Blanc's chapter, entitled *Mystères du Temple*, in t. xii.

the capture of Roses. But in the western Pyrenees Moncey had gained a series of victories in June and July at Deva, Inurzun, and Pampeluna. The French entered Vittoria July 18th. Madrid trembled for its safety, when it was relieved by the tidings that a peace had been concluded.

The Treaty of Basle, between France and Spain, was signed July 22nd 1795. France restored all her Spanish conquests, and Spain ceded her portion of St. Domingo, at that time no very desirable possession.[43] The Court of Madrid also proclaimed its recognition not only of the French but also of the Batavian Republic, and engaged to employ all its influence to detach Portugal from the English alliance. This treaty, by which the Spanish House of Bourbon recognised the Power which had overthrown its eldest branch, was hailed with extravagant joy at Madrid. Emmanuel Godoy, Duke of Alcudia, under whose auspices it had been effected, was loaded with presents, and received the title of "Prince of the Peace."[44]

But while the French Government was thus disembarrassing itself of its foreign enemies, it was threatened with new dangers from within. The cruelties exercised by the Republicans in La Vendée excited a fresh insurrection there in 1794. Charette and Stofflet had been assisted by the Marquis de Puisaye and other gentlemen of Brittany. Bands of *Chouans*, composed of adventurers and smugglers, continued to exist in the Calvados and the Morbihan; and Puisaye applied to England to aid them with some regular troops, and with arms and ammunition. A small expedition was accordingly prepared in England in the spring of 1795, which was joined by French emigrants and released prisoners, to the number of about 3000 men. This little band, with arms and equipments for a considerable army, were landed by Admiral Bridport, after defeating a French squadron, on the peninsula of Quiberon, June 27th.[45] On the appearance of the English fleet, Charette and Stofflet had flown to arms, proclaimed Louis XVIII.; 1500 *Chouans* joined the invaders. Fort Penthière was seized; but General Hoche and the Republican army, after a blockade of three weeks, surprised and captured the fort on the night of July 20th. Some of the garrison succeeded in reaching the English fleet, but

[43] Martens, t. vi. p. 124.

[44] In a Decree of September 12th, among several honours conferred on Godoy, he was allowed to add to his armorial bearings the somewhat equivocal distinction of a Janus, or double-faced bust, over his ducal crown, typifying his prudence in tracing past causes and foreseeing future events! See the diploma in the *Politisches Journal*, 1796, B. i. S. 113: Garden, t. v. p. 307.

[45] For this expedition, see the *Mémoires of Puisaye*, t. vi.

the night being stormy a far greater number perished in the attempt; the remainder surrendered, on condition, as they understood, that their lives should be spared. There seems to have been a verbal convention to that effect between Hoche and M. de Sombreuil, one of the leaders of the expedition, which, however, was not ratified by the representatives of the people.[46] The ferocious Tallien incited the Convention not to spare the prisoners. All who had emigrated, including De Sombreuil and the Bishop of Dol, were shot at Vannes; the rest were spared. Charette retaliated by causing some hundreds of Republicans who were in his power to be massacred.

In spite of the disastrous issue of this expedition, another was attempted a few months later under the conduct of the Count d'Artois. Several thousand English troops and French emigrants were landed at the Isle Dieu, a few leagues from the coast of La Vendée, October 2nd. The prince, however, hesitated to throw himself into that district, and the weather having become stormy, the expedition returned after a few weeks to England. Hoche now directed his arms against Charette. That leader and Stofflet were soon after captured and shot, and the remains of the insurrection dissipated.

The Count d'Artois' hesitation to land in La Vendée is thought to have been connected with the failure of an insurrection at Paris, 13th *Vendémiaire* (Oct. 5th), caused by an important revolution.[47] The progress of the reactionary movement having produced a wish for the abolishment of the constitution of 1793, a Committee was appointed to draw up a fresh one. The new scheme[48] was characterised by the rejection of the ultra-democratic principles which had marked that of 1793. To the Declaration of Rights was appended a Declaration of Duties, in the eighth article of which it was declared that social order depends on the maintenance of property. The two degrees of election, or the primary and electoral assemblies, were re-established: a residence of at least a year was required as a qualification for the former, and moderate conditions of property for the latter. Thus the middle class recovered its political importance. The legislative power was vested in two chambers; a lower one of 500 members, called the Council of Five Hundred, and an upper one of 250 members, called the Council of the Ancients. The Five Hundred, whose members must have attained the age of thirty years, alone possessed the right of proposing laws; while the Ancients, consisting of men

[46] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvi. p. 482.
[47] Blanc, t. xii. p. 569.
[48] See *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvi. end.

passed the age of forty, and either married or widowers, had only the privilege of a *veto*. The Ancients were elected from the same class as the Five Hundred; and thus the distinction between the two chambers, besides the qualification of marriage, namely, the difference of ten years in the period of eligibility, was not very great, as old men were not excluded from the Five Hundred. By this arrangement, however, measures were at least submitted to more mature deliberation, and the danger of being carried away by sudden impulses to which popular assemblies, and especially those of France, are liable, was obviated. The Ancients, except in urgent cases, were not to decide till a bill had been read three times, with an interval of at least five days between each reading. A third part of each Council was to be replaced every year by new members.

The executive power was entirely separated from the legislative, and instead of being vested in committees of the National Assemblies, was intrusted to a DIRECTORY, consisting of five persons, to whom a guard was assigned, a civil list, and a residence in the Luxembourg. The Directors were to be selected by the Ancients from a list of ten persons presented by the Five Hundred. Each Director in turn was to preside over the Directory for a space of three months; and one Director was to be replaced every year by a fresh election. Thus the royal prerogative, as established by the constitution of 1791, was now divided between the Ancients, who had the *veto*, and the Directory, which had the executive power. The Directors were to appoint six ministers, to conduct negociations, manage the finances, the army, &c., and they were to be responsible for the acts of their ministers and generals, as if they were their own. This government was humorously compared to a chariot with six horses, whose reins were held by five coachmen, while 750 superintendents administered the whip. What could be expected, but that the horses should run away, and dash the chariot to pieces? However, amid the shock of passions and opinions, and the mistrust and suspicions of the republican leaders, it was perhaps as good a government as the conjuncture allowed.

Warned by the example of the Constituent Assembly, who, by handing over their constitution to an entirely new legislature, soon saw it utterly destroyed, the moderate party in the Convention, led by Daunou, called the *parti conventionnel*, which desired neither the triumph of the royalists nor of the ultra-democrats, carried a Decree, 13th *Fructidor* (Aug. 30th), that two-thirds of each of the new chambers should be elected from among the members of the

Convention. The new constitution, as well as this decree, was submitted to the approval of the primary assemblies throughout France, and the acceptance of both by large majorities was proclaimed in the Assembly, 1st *Vendémiaire* (Sept. 23rd 1795).[49] But this was an artifice. The Constitution had indeed been accepted, and the Conventional Party pretended that the decree of 13th *Fructidor* formed part of it, although a great majority of the assemblies had declared themselves against it.[50] Hence the insurrection, before alluded to, of 13th *Vendémiaire*. It was principally the work of the royalists, and of the higher and middle classes. The emigrants and priests had now returned to Paris in great numbers; the faubourg St. Germain had begun to recover its former gaiety; the *Chouan* uniform was the fashionable costume. On the other hand, the populace having not only been disarmed, but finding itself deceived in its hopes, misled by artifices and calumnies, and without work or bread, was occupied solely with care for the passing day, and had sunk into a state of the profoundest apathy about political affairs. Among the leaders of the insurrection were the old Duke of Nivernais, the Generals Miranda and Servan, Laharpe, Quatremère de Quincy, and other distinguished persons. Petitions were got up against the decree of 13th *Fructidor*; thirty-two of the forty-eight sections joined the movement, and the Convention soon discovered that an appeal to force was contemplated.

The Convention could rely upon the regular army alone. Troops were moved up to Paris, and the command of them was given to Barras, the general of 9th *Thermidor*. Barras demanded, as his second, Napoleon Bonaparte, who, having returned from the army of Italy, was now in Paris, and apparently in very distressed circumstances. The sketch of a plan for an Italian campaign, which he afterwards executed himself, had procured him the post of chief of the *Bureau Topographique*. Scarcely, however, had he obtained this appointment when the Committee of Public Welfare struck his name out of the list of generals on active service for having refused to command a brigade of artillery in the war of La Vendée. In this turn of his fortunes, Bonaparte had entertained the idea of proceeding to Constantinople and entering the Sultan's service, when he was diverted from it by the events of 13th *Vendémiaire*.[51]

[49] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvii. p. 25.

[50] Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 371, 379.

[51] This account differs in some essential particulars from that given by Napoleon himself in the *Mémorial de S. Helène*, ch. v.; where he represents himself as elected *general-in-chief* by the Convention, without mentioning Barras, and is made to deny the project of going to Constantinople. But Barras, in his *Report* to the Conven-

Bonaparte acted with promptitude and decision. He caused the artillery at the camp of Les Sablons, already menaced with capture by the insurgents, to be seized and brought to Paris, planted it round the Tuileries, before which he also arranged the army of the Convention, some 5000 men. The armed insurgents, numbering from 25,000 to 30,000 men, under the command of General Danican, made their attack about three in the afternoon, on one side by the Pont Neuf, on the other by the Rue St. Honoré. Danican having sent a parlementary to the Convention requiring them to disarm their troops, Boissy d'Anglas and some other members, were for negociating; but Chénier flew to the tribune and declared that there was no alternative but death or victory. Volleys of musketry soon afterwards announced that the conflict had begun; 700 muskets were brought into the Assembly, and the members armed themselves as a *corps de reserve*. As the insurgents were crossing the Pont Royal with cries of *Vive le Roi!* the artillery, taking them in front and flank, threw them into disorder and flight. The combat was more obstinate on the side of the Rue St. Honoré and Palais Royal; where it was not before nine o'clock in the evening that they were driven from all their posts; but after a loss of life variously estimated, order was entirely restored.[52] The Convention used its victory with moderation. Of the military leaders of the insurgents, Lafond alone was executed. On the motion of Barras, Bonaparte was named second in command of the Army of the Interior, Barras himself retaining the command-in-chief.

The Convention now proceeded to form the two new Chambers and the Directory. As the electors had not returned two-thirds of its members to the new Chambers, those who had been elected formed themselves into an Electoral Assembly to supply the deficiency. The late counter-revolutionary insurrection influenced the choice of Directors, who were selected from among the members of the late Convention, and, indeed, the majority of them had been regicides. They were Réveillère-Lepaux, Sieyès, Rewbel, Letourneur, and Barras. Sieyès, however, declined to serve, and was replaced by Carnot. Of these men, none had particularly distinguished himself except Carnot, who, in the popular phrase, had

tion concerning the insurrection, says: "le général Bonaparte . . . fut nommé, sur ma proposition, commandant *en second*." (*Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvii. p. 50 sq.) And there exists among the Registers of the Committee of Public Welfare not only an *arrêté* authorising him to proceed to Constantinople, but also a note or *rédaction* of the project by Bonaparte himself. Blanc, t. xii. p. 552 sqq., and notes.

[52] For this insurrection see Barras' Report, already quoted, and that of Merlin in the same vol. of the *Hist. Parl.*

"organised victory" by his military projects and reforms. Barras, a gentleman of Provence, had been a representative of the people at the siege and massacre of Toulon. Menaced on that account by Robespierre, he had taken part against that demagogue on the 9th *Thermidor*, and had subsequently joined the reactionary party. Réveillère-Lepaux, a gentleman of Anjou, had voted in the Convention against the death of the King, and had been proscribed as a Girondist. Rewbel had been *procureur fiscal* in Alsace, and had served with Merlin at Mentz as representative of the people; but was accused of not having done his duty, and suspected of having accepted Prussian gold. Of Letourneur little or nothing was known. Rewbel, of an imperious character, took the lead in the Directory, assumed the departments of foreign affairs, finance, and justice. Barras, ignorant and idle, though capable of acting with decision on an emergency, had the direction of the police, for which the suppleness of his character seemed to qualify him. Réveillère-Lepaux, a visionary belonging to a sect called *theophilanthropes*, but, in spite of his absurdities, of a mild and moderate character, presided over education, science, art, manufactures, &c. Carnot had the war office, and Letourneur the administration of the navy and colonies.

The Convention held its last sitting, 4th *Brumaire* an IV (October 26th 1795), when it passed a general amnesty, with only a few exceptions, changed the name of the *Place de la Révolution* to that of *Place de la Concorde*, and declared its session terminated.[53] It had lasted rather more than three years.

What was now the condition of France after six years of revolution, and the reign of *virtue* enforced by *terror*? The work of a Republican, a Member of the Convention and of the Council of Five Hundred,[54] will convey some idea of it. There was not a *sou* in the treasury. *Assignats* were almost valueless;[55] the quantity absolutely necessary for the service of the following day was printed over night. Public credit was annihilated; there was no regular system of revenue, not a tax whose produce was worth carrying to account. Yet in this state of things it was necessary to feed the capital *gratis*, to supply the great towns and the army of the interior. Each inhabitant of Paris of the poorer sort received

[53] *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvii. p. 88.

[54] Bailleul, *Examen crit. de l'ouvrage de Madame de Staël sur la Rev. Fr.*, t. ii. p. 276 sq.

[55] On the 22nd *Brumaire*, a few weeks after the installation of the Directory, when they demanded from the legislature some means to obviate the prevailing famine, the exchange for the *louis d'or* was from 3000 to 3180 *livres* in *assignats*. *Hist. Parl.* t. xxxvii. p. 110. The issue of *assignats* ceased January 30th 1796, as they no longer paid the expense of manufacture. At this time, the exchange for the *louis d'or* was 5300 *livres* in paper. Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 419.

only two ounces of bread a day or a handful of rice, and even this wretched supply was often wanting. Meat, oil, sugar, and other necessaries could scarcely be procured. The state of the provinces was not better. The conveyance of a load of corn from one village to another could often be effected only by an exchange of musket shots. The forests were exposed to pillage. The armies were without clothes or bread. All the main roads, canals, bridges, and other public works were in a deplorable state of dilapidation. The moral state of France was as bad as the physical. There was no longer any public education; the recent convulsions had produced a shameless cynicism; public decency was openly outraged in every possible manner. Bands of brigands, called *chauffeurs*, had been organised, who scoured the country in all directions, committing the most horrible excesses. Thus the French nation, by attempting to carry into practice the theories of Rousseau, had almost attained the *beau idéal* of that philosopher's anti-social state, and become dissolved into its primitive and barbaric elements. Indeed a French historian of the Revolution[56] observes with much *naïveté*, "This epoch—that of the Directory—beheld the termination of the movement towards freedom, and the commencement of that towards *civilisation*." The first dream of the French, he proceeds to observe, had been liberty and a constitutional monarchy; the next, equality, fraternity, and a republic: but at the commencement of the Directory, people no longer believed in anything; all had been lost in the great strife of parties, the virtue of the middle classes, as well as that of the populace. The public amusements, in which, we suppose, may be included the republican and atheistical fêtes and processions, and the exciting little interlude of the *guillotine*, had ceased, and people began to direct their thoughts towards the pleasures of private life. The revival of *civilisation* was marked by the balls, feasts, debauches, display of sumptuous equipages, and other luxuries, which again became the order of the day.

As the year 1795 drew to a close, the aspect of her foreign affairs was hardly more encouraging for France than that of her domestic state. Her fleets were nearly destroyed; Corsica was in the hands of the English; Prussia, Spain, and Tuscany had, indeed, been detached from the Coalition, but a large part of Europe still remained arrayed against her; Switzerland, though neutral, was the centre of plots against the Republic; Holland, by reason of the anarchy which reigned there, was rather an encumbrance than

[56] Mignet, *Hist. de la Rep. Fr.*, t. ii. p. 145.

a help. The submission of the United Provinces to French domination had produced a war with England. The Dutch colonies of Demerara, Berbice, and Essequibo, in the West Indies, those of Ceylon, Malacca, Cochin, and other of their settlements in the East Indies, as well as the Cape of Good Hope, fell into the hands of the English. The French had, indeed, recovered the islands of St. Lucie and St. Vincent, which they were destined to lose again the following year. In the interior, the troops were deserting in bands, with their arms and baggage. There was no concert or unity of views either in the Legislative Chamber or in the Directory. The French arms had been successful in Italy, but the war on the Rhine had terminated in disaster. To these campaigns we must now advert.

Owing to the negociations at Basle, as well perhaps as to the distressed condition of the French armies, no military operations took place on the north-eastern frontier till September; except that Marshal Bender, despairing of being relieved, surrendered Luxembourg to the French, June 5th. The following was the position of the armies on the Rhine. Pichegru occupied the left bank of that river from Hüningen to Mannheim, while the Austrians under Wurmser were opposed to him on the other bank. Clairfait, who had the command-in-chief not only of the Austrian armies but also that of the Empire, occupied the Rhine from Mannheim to Düsseldorf, with his centre at Mentz. Opposed to him was Jourdan with the army of the Sambre and Meuse. The Prussians, as an army of observation, occupied the line of demarcation already described. On September 6th, two divisions of the army of the Sambre and Meuse crossed the Rhine at Duisburg and Neuss, when the Austrians retired behind the Lahn. On the 15th Jourdan crossed at Neuwied with his centre. Pichegru had appeared before Mannheim on the 14th, and on the 18th that town capitulated, when the Elector Palatine made the arrangement already mentioned. After the fall of Mannheim, Clairfait retreated between the Main and Neckar; but Quosdanowich and Klenau having beaten the French at Handschuheim, September 24th, and thus restored the communications between Clairfait and Wurmser, Mannheim was blockaded, and the Austrians in their turn began to advance. Clairfait, crossing the Main at Aschaffenburg, defeated the French at Bergen, October 11th, pushed on beyond Wetzlar, driving away the Prussian pickets, and violating the neutral line, and was thus in a position to turn the left wing of the army of the Sambre and Meuse, which fled in disorder over the Rhine. Abandoning its pursuit, Clairfait suddenly turned

towards Mentz, which Jourdan had invested, and surrounded with enormous lines of circumvallation. The French, surprised by the unexpected attack of the main body of the Austrians, were driven from their lines, thrown into disorder, and so terribly cut up by Clairfait's cavalry, that this battle decided the campaign. Their baggage, ammunition, and whole park of artillery fell into the hands of the victor (October 29th). Clairfait's success was aided by the treachery of Pichegru. That general, who contemplated playing the part of Monk, and restoring the monarchy, entered into correspondence with the Prince of Condé, and was tempted with the most magnificent offers; but he hesitated when required to arrest at once the representatives of the people and proclaim Louis XVIII. on the left bank of the Rhine. He disconcerted, however, the French operations by neglecting, after the capture of Mannheim, to march as instructed with the greater part of his forces on the Main, to cut off Clairfait's retreat and form a junction with Jourdan. He contented himself with sending 10,000 men to Heidelberg, who were soon completely beaten.[57]

In consequence of these defeats the French held, on the right bank of the Rhine, only Mannheim and Düsseldorf; and Mannheim they were forced to surrender by capitulation to Wurmser (November 22nd). Yet, in spite of his successes, Clairfait concluded with the French an unaccountable armistice, December 31st, for an indefinite period, and terminable at ten days' notice. It seems probable that he acted on secret instructions from Thugut.[58] Nevertheless, on his return to Vienna, he was called to a severe account by the Aulic Council of War, and dismissed from the command. The Archduke Charles, the Emperor's brother, was appointed in his place. In Italy, as we have said, the French arms were more prosperous. The peace with Spain proved of great service to them in the Italian campaign. Schérer, with the army of the Eastern Pyrenees, proceeded into Italy, and inflicted a severe defeat on De Vins, the Austrian general at Loano, on the Genoese Riviera, November 23rd and 24th. This battle, the only one deserving the name during four campaigns in Italy, cost the Austro-Sardinians 7000 men killed, wounded, or prisoners, eighty guns and all their magazines, compelled them to retreat to their entrenched camp at Ceva, and by the occupation of Savona opened Piedmont to the French in the following year. The victory is chiefly ascribed to Masséna.

[57] Blanc, *Hist. de la Révol. Fr.*, t. xii. p. 475 sqq.

[58] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 274. Montgaillard, t. iv. p. 412, says, that it was entered into on account of the negociations between Condé and Pichegru, of which Condé had informed the Austrian generals.

The establishment of a new and apparently more firm and orderly Government in France had inspired the British Ministry with the hope that it might not be impossible to effect a peace. A bad harvest and other causes had produced a good deal of distress in England; discontent had manifested itself in sedition and riots, and cries for *Bread* and *Peace*. The King, in a message to Parliament, December 1795, announced that the new order of things in France would enable him to enter into negociations should the enemy be so disposed; and Mr. Wickham, the English minister in Switzerland, was authorised to make some propositions, of an unformal kind, to M. Barthélemy, the French ambassador there, in order to sound the intentions of the Directory. But the English advances were met by a contemptuous answer, the motives for making them were coarsely and sneeringly impugned, and a flat refusal was intimated to restore any conquests that had been incorporated, like the Netherlands, with France, not, be it observed, by any regular treaty, but by a mere decree of the French Legislature. Thus all negociation was necessarily at an end. Some overtures made by Austria were also disregarded. Under these circumstances, Pitt advanced the Austrians, in the course of 1796, on the responsibility of the Ministry, a subsidy of 1,200,000*l.* In December the Parliament not only allowed this sum on the next budget, but also granted a further subsidy of 1,800,000*l.*[59] In fact, the Directory took no pains to conceal that they were desirous of war, as appeared from their official journal, the *Rédacteur*.[60] There seemed to be little, either in the state of France or of the armies, to justify their confidence. But they were to give another proof of that vigour of action with which revolutionary governments are frequently accompanied. The Directors were indefatigable. They assembled every morning at eight o'clock, and after working till four or five, met again at eight in the evening, and prolonged their labours till late in the night.[61] Their cares were crowned with success. Confidence was restored, and was followed by commerce and abundance. After a month, Paris could be left to find its own supplies; in half a year all France had wonderfully recovered from its state of prostration. The Revolution had not been attended with unmixed evil. The abolishment of corporations, *maîtrises*, and other exclusive privileges, had stimulated private industry; the sales of landed property had elevated the peasant in the social scale. Under a more moderate government these happier results began to develope themselves. But as tranquillity returned at home,

[59] Garden, t. v. p. 312.
[60] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 286 sqq.; Garden, t. v. p. 310.
[61] Bailleul, t. ii. p. 287.

the French Government began more and more to direct its views abroad. From this period the Revolution assumes a military character. A *propaganda*, enforced at the cannon's mouth, pretends to establish republican reforms, while its real objects are the extension of French dominion by conquest, and the spoliation of the conquered. But under this system of treachery, and falsehood, and ambition, the French Republic itself at last yields to the fortunate general whom it had intrusted with the execution of its schemes.

CHAPTER VIII.

The Directory having resolved upon war, adopted a plan for the campaign of 1796 upon a scale of grandeur hitherto unparalleled in the annals of modern strategy. Two armies were to penetrate into Austria, one by Southern Germany, the other by Northern Italy and the Tyrol, and, having formed a junction, were to dictate a peace to the Emperor in his capital. Conquests were to be achieved in Italy which might serve to exchange against the Austrian Netherlands, and the Directory made no secret that Venice especially was destined to be the victim. By way of picking a quarrel, they required the Venetian Government to dismiss from Verona the Count of Provence, who, since the death of his nephew in the Temple, had assumed the title of Louis XVIII. The Venetian Senate itself had, indeed, never publicly recognised Louis in that new dignity, but he had received at Verona ministers from the Courts of St. Petersburg, Madrid, and London. The Venetian Senate, with that mean compliance which marks their conduct at this period, and which proved the chief cause of their destruction, having ordered him to depart from their dominions, Louis, with natural indignation, demanded that the name of the Bourbons should be erased from the Golden Book of the Republic, and that the armour presented to it by his ancestor Henry IV. should be restored; and, under the name of Count Grosbois, betook himself to the army of the French emigrants, at Freiburg in the Breisgau.[1]

The projected campaign was to be carried out in Germany by the army of the Rhine, now under Moreau, and by that of the Sambre and Meuse still commanded by Jourdan. Moreau was to penetrate into Suabia and advance by the Lake of Constance, keeping pace with the assumed successes and advance of the army of Italy; while the army of the Sambre and Meuse, leaving its right wing on the Rhine, was to advance into Germany on a more northern line, parallel to and supporting Moreau's left. The neutrality of Switzerland secured the flanks both of the armies of Italy and of the Rhine. The war, especially in Italy,

[1] Botta, t. i. lib. vi. p. 310 sqq.

was to be made to support itself by confiscations; and the smaller Italian princes were to be forced to join the French. Napoleon Bonaparte was appointed to the command of the army of Italy, the first important step in his marvellous career. Schérer had been condemned for not pushing his advantages after the victory of Loano. Bonaparte, now aged twenty-six, had not yet proved himself as a commander-in-chief; but he had shown talent and decision at the siege of Toulon, and in the insurrection of 13th *Vendémiaire*, for which last feat the Directors were personally his debtors; while the plan of the Italian campaign betrayed a genius which might be well intrusted with its execution. To these public motives were added those of private friendship. He had obliged Barras by marrying his mistress, Josephine, widow of General Beauharnais; which fascinating Creole seems to have made a lasting impression on Napoleon's heart. He was also supported by the friendship of Carnot and Tallien.

Bonaparte arrived at Nice to take the command of his army, March 27th 1796.[2] It counted some 45,000 troops, good soldiers, but in a wretched state of destitution. He adopted from the first the custom of working upon the imagination of his men, one of the great secrets of his success. He electricized them before marching in an address conceived in the style of antiquity, in which he promised them not only honour, but also wealth and glory in the fertile plains and rich cities of Italy. His course was facilitated by the want of cohesion and hearty cooperation among the Austro-Sardinians. The Cabinet of Vienna had hardly shown good faith in the Treaty of Valenziana. It had been stipulated that the Germans should fight only in the plains; and the Aulic Council of War had instructed the generals to avoid perilous engagements, to keep close together, to spare their soldiers, and reserve them for the defence of Lombardy.[3] Austria had only 28,000 men in Italy, now commanded by Beaulieu, De Vins having been superseded. The Sardinian army numbered 40,000 men, but of these 15,000 under the Duke d'Aosta were employed in watching Kellermann, who occupied Savoy, and some 5000 men were in garrisons. The main body, commanded by Colli, stretched from the Bormida on its left, to the Stura on its right, covering Coni, Mendovi, and Ceva, at which last place it had an entrenched camp. The main body of the Austrians, in order to cover Lombardy, was cantoned

[2] For the Italian campaigns of Bonaparte, to which we can devote only space enough for a very meagre sketch, see, besides Jomini, *Campagnes du général Bonaparte en Italie pendant les années IV et V*, par un Officier Général (M. de Pommereul).

[3] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 297.

in the environs of Alessandria and Tortona, and of the two roads leading to Genoa and Milan.

On the French side, the divisions of Masséna and Augereau were posted at Loano, Finale, and Savona; Serrurier was ordered to proceed to Garessio, to observe the entrenched camp at Ceva; and Laharpe was directed to march on Voltri and threaten Genoa. Two roads were open to the invaders: that of Genoa by the defiles of the Bochetta, and that of Savona, between the Col St. Jacques and Col di Cadibone. Bonaparte chose the latter. From Savona to Carcare was only nine miles, over a mountainous route indeed, but which might be made practicable for artillery; and from Carcare several roads led through the Montferrat into the interior of Piedmont. Bonaparte's route lay through the valley of the Bormida; and here he was to separate the Sardinians and the Austrians, threatening at once Lombardy and Piedmont. The French minister loudly demanded from the Genoese the keys of the fortress of Gavi; thus pretending, in order to cover the real design, that the French army would penetrate into Lombardy by Genoa and the Bochetta. Beaulieu, however, had received information of the real plan of attack and resolved to seize Montenotte, the key of the French position, which Bonaparte had neglected sufficiently to strengthen, before it could receive further reinforcements. For this purpose he detached d'Argenteau, with instructions to attack Montenotte by April 6th. Thinking, however, that Voltri was not to be neglected, where Cervoni had arrived with Laharpe's advanced guard, he himself marched thither with his left wing; and being assisted from the sea by an English squadron under Nelson, he compelled the French to a precipitate retreat, April 8th. But by this movement he had receded with his left wing to a distance from the real point of attack at Montenotte, and D'Argenteau, to whom he had intrusted that point, proved incompetent and failed. He had, indeed, nearly succeeded in the first assault, and took two of the French lines out of three. But he had delayed too long. On April 10th, at daybreak, Bonaparte in person, with Augereau's and Masséna's divisions, debouched from behind Montenotte, attacked D'Argenteau and drove him back in such confusion that he retreated to Paretto, three leagues beyond Dego, thus abandoning that important post. On hearing the state of affairs, Beaulieu hastened to the scene of action, but was detained several hours by the breaking down of his carriage. At Acqui he succeeded in rallying 6000 or 7000 men. Boyer, however, interfered, and prevented his forming a junction with D'Argenteau, and Dego fell into the hands of the French. Bonaparte, in his despatches to the Directory,

pretended that he had defeated here Beaulieu in person, although that general was many miles off. He called his victory in these parts the battle of Millesimo, apparently because Augereau seized the gorges so named in order to attack the castle of Cosseria, which made a spirited resistance. The battle of Millesimo is therefore a fiction, nor is that of Montenotte much better, having been merely an affair of outposts.[4] Bonaparte's fame in these affairs must rest on his general plan and his manœuvres.

By advancing his left rapidly on the Tanaro, Bonaparte now attained his chief object of separating the Sardinians and Austrians. Augereau and Serrurier were directed to combine their forces and march on Colli's camp at Ceva. It is said that, in a military point of view, Bonaparte should rather have attacked Beaulieu at Acqui before he could rally his scattered forces. But the French general was a politician as well as a soldier. His object was to force the King of Sardinia to a separate peace. Striking to the left, he crossed the Tanaro, with the intention of turning the camp at Ceva; but Colli abandoned it in the night of April 16th, and repassing the Tanaro, retired behind the Corsaglia, in the direction of Mondovì: a movement which consummated his separation from the Austrians. Beaulieu informed Colli that if he held out three days at Mondovì he should be relieved. But Bonaparte, leaving Ceva behind, had followed Colli thither, drove him thence after a skirmish which he dignifies with the name of a battle, when Mondovì was abandoned to pillage. Colli now retreated behind the Stura and took up a position between Coni and Cherasco, in order to cover Turin, where the consternation was extreme. Beaulieu, on learning his retreat, advanced his headquarters from Acqui to Bosco, his left leaning on Novi, his right on Alessandria, to enable him to form a junction with Colli at Asti; and knowing that there was at Turin a party in favour of peace, he demanded to be put in possession of Alessandria, Tortona, and Ceva: but Victor Amadeus refused the demand. Meanwhile Bonaparte had pushed on to Cherasco, a very strong place at the confluence of the Stura and Tanaro, the only obstacle to his marching on Turin. At the news of his advance, Victor Amadeus recalled Colli under the walls of that capital. In a council held April 22nd, the King, at the persuasion of Cardinal Costa, Archbishop of Turin, determined to treat at Genoa for a peace with France, under the mediation of Spain. Colli now demanded an armistice; which, however, was refused by Bonaparte, unless the three fortresses of Coni, Alessandria, and Tortona were put into his

[4] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 319.

hands. Pursuing his march, the French general appeared before Cherasco, which, at the first summons of his aide-de-camp, Marmont, surrendered without a blow. Victor Amadeus now sent to accept the conditions of the conqueror. A suspension of arms was signed at Cherasco, April 28th, till a definitive peace should be concluded, the treaty for which purpose was signed at Paris May 15th. The King of Sardinia engaged to renounce the Coalition, to cede to France Savoy, and the counties of Nice, Tende, and Beuil, to permit no French emigrants to sojourn in his states, to grant an amnesty to all his subjects prosecuted for their political opinions. The French troops were to occupy, till a general pacification, Coni, Ceva, Tortona, the fortresses of Exilles, La Sieta, Suza, Brunetta, and Château Dauphin, and either Alessandria or Valenza, at the option of the French commander-in-chief. The French troops to be allowed free passage through the King's dominions.[5] By this pacification Kellermann's army of the Alps was rendered available.

Victor Amadeus III., debilitated by age, rendered himself by this humiliating treaty little more than the vassal of the French Republic. He had yielded to a surprise. No important place was yet in the hands of the French; who, having entered Piedmont through a defile, had not even siege artillery. Bonaparte acknowledged twenty years later at St. Helena, that the slightest check would have ruined all his plans. In refusing to shelter the French emigrants, Victor Amadeus did not even except his two daughters, married to the brothers of Louis XVI., who had been placed on the list of emigrants, and it lay in the power of a French commissary to tear them from their father's arms. His misfortunes and disgrace probably accelerated his death. He expired October 16th 1796, in the seventieth year of his age and twenty-third of his reign, and was succeeded by his son Charles Emmanuel IV. This prince is said to have advised the treaty with France; it is, at all events, certain that immediately after his accession, he expressed in the most humble terms his attachment to the French Republic.[6]

Beaulieu had advanced to Nizza della Paglia with 15,000 men, but halted on hearing of the negociations. He formed a plan to seize by surprise Alessandria, Valenza, and Tortona, which succeeded only at Valenza. Victor Amadeus, however, had required him to withdraw the Neapolitan dragoons, who had seized that place, and to put it into the hands of Bonaparte. But the French general,

[5] Martens, t. vi. p. 208 sqq. (2de Ed.)

[6] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 487.

after animating his troops with one of those magniloquent proclamations which he understood so well to season to their taste, proceeded by forced marches to Piacenza, where he crossed the Po; thus turning Beaulieu's position, who had crossed at Valenza, and taken the road to Pavia. Beaulieu now retired upon the Adda, with the view both of securing his retreat by the Tyrol, and throwing a garrison into Mantua; leaving therefore his rear-guard at Lodi, with orders to defend the bridge over the Adda, he pursued his march towards the Oglio. On the following day, May 10th, Bonaparte arrived at Lodi, and carried the bridge after a desperate fight, which, however, has been much exaggerated by French writers.[7] Beaulieu's object was only to detain the French twenty-four hours. Milan, already passed by ten leagues, and now at Bonaparte's mercy, sent its keys. He entered that city May 14th, not with republican simplicity but regal pomp, took up his lodging in the archducal palace, organised a new municipal government. The citadel, however, held out till June 29th. Bonaparte did not revolutionise the Milanese; it was to be kept to serve as an exchange in negociations with Austria.

Bonaparte's rapid and splendid conquests had excited the jealousy and suspicion of the Directory. They apprehended his ambitious schemes, and in order to defeat them, resolved to transfer to Kellermann the command of the army of Italy. Bonaparte was to be detached on an expedition to Leghorn, Rome, and Naples, which they represented to him as a much more glorious field of enterprise. Had this measure been carried out, Bonaparte would probably never have risen above the rank of a general. But he strained every nerve to defeat it, and succeeded. He represented to the Directory, in the strongest terms, the impolicy of dividing the command. He gained Barras by informing him that a million livres were at his disposal at Genoa. Josephine's influence was exerted with that Director and with Carnot. Both were conciliated; which was the more important, as each had his party. At a second meeting, the Directory reconsidered the matter, and gave Bonaparte their entire confidence. Thus he became virtually the master of Italy.[8]

The Directory had resolved to seize the spoils of Italy, and Bonaparte had adopted the Roman maxim, that the war must support itself. Immense contributions were levied on the con-

[7] See General von Klausewitz, *Der Feldzug von* 1796, ap. Schlosser, *Gesch. des* 18*en. Jahrhunderts*, B. v. S. 747. The Austrians had only 7000 men and 14 guns. The French represent their forces at 10,000 men and 30 guns.

[8] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 348 sqq.

quered states. The Lombards had to contribute twenty million francs. The Duke of Parma, although he had not joined the Coalition, obtained a suspension of arms only through the good offices of the King of Spain, his brother-in-law, and by signing a treaty, May 8th, by which he agreed to pay two million livres, to find 700 horses, and to allow the French general to select twenty pictures from his collections.[9] This was the first time in the history of civilised warfare that works of art had been subjected to spoliation. The Duke of Modena, a prince of the House of Este, hastened to follow the example of his neighbours. He purchased an armistice by agreeing to pay within a month 7,500,000 livres, and 2,500,000 more in goods and warlike stores; also, to deliver twenty pictures (May 12th.)[10] This enormous sacrifice, however, did not save him. Bonaparte revoked the armistice in October, on the pretext that the Modenese had supplied Mantua with provisions. The duke had fled to Venice with his private treasures. Other small Italian princes were also forced to purchase peace. The hatred engendered by these oppressions produced an insurrection against the French in Pavia. Bonaparte instantly marched thither with a small body of troops, battered down the gates with artillery, abandoned the town to pillage, shot the leaders of the insurgents, and returned to his army. Rather later, symptoms of hostility, encouraged by the Austrian minister at Genoa, began to show themselves in that republic. The routes through Genoa, Savona, and Nice were almost intercepted: the Genoese nobles secretly supported every plot against the French army. Bonaparte caused the château of the Marquis of Spinola, at Arquata, the centre of these plots, to be razed.

The van of the French army in pursuit of Beaulieu entered Brescia, May 28th. This town belonged to the Venetians, who despatched *proveditori* to protest against this breach of their neutrality. But it was a natural result of their irresolute conduct. Placed between two great belligerent Powers, they had not the courage to declare for either, nay, not even to establish an armed neutrality, and they were consequently subjected to the insults of both. Beaulieu also violated Venetian neutrality by seizing Peschiera, a strong fortress on the Mincio, where it issues from the Lago di Garda; behind which river he had determined to make a stand, in order to protect Mantua, to which his left extended. But Bonaparte, after some feints upon Peschiera, attacked his centre

[9] Martens, t. vi. p. 223.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 232.

at Borghetto, May 30th; and after two days' hard fighting, attended with great loss, carried all the Austrian positions, and effected the passage of the Mincio. It was in consequence of Bonaparte's threats to the *proveditore* Foscarini, at Peschiera, May 31st, that the Venetians resolved to arm; recalled their ships towards the city, and ordered Slavonian regiments to be raised in Istria, Dalmatia, and Albania.[11] Beaulieu, after throwing 13,000 men into Mantua, now retreated on the Adige, pursued by Augereau, and traversing the Venetian territory took up a position with 15,000 men in the gorges of the Tyrol; while Bonaparte seized Peschiera, and began to threaten and intimidate the Venetians.[12] Venice, one of the oldest European states, was to fall by its indecision as well as by its cowardice. Sending for Foscarini, *proveditore* of Verona, Bonaparte told him that he should march upon Venice; that he was inclined to burn Verona to its foundations, for sheltering the pretender Louis XVIII., thus affecting to be the capital of France; that he had sent Masséna to destroy it. To appease his anger, the *proveditore* threw open the gates of Verona. Bonaparte entered that city June 3rd, and immediately seized the citadel, arming it with Venetian guns. Mantua was then invested by the French.

The King of the Two Sicilies hastened to make an arrangement with the French, while his neutrality might still be of some value. By an armistice signed at Brescia, June 5th, he agreed to withdraw his troops from the Austrian army, his ships from the English fleet.[13] Ferdinand IV. did not, however, disarm; he made preparations to defend his frontiers in case of attack, kept 60,000 men on foot, and by this spirited conduct obtained more moderate conditions in the definitive treaty of peace than the Directory had attempted to impose upon him. Bonaparte dissuaded a war with Naples, for which he calculated that a reinforcement of 21,000 men would be necessary.[14] By the treaty signed at Paris, October 10th, Ferdinand agreed to be neutral, and to shut his ports against all vessels of war belonging to belligerents, that should exceed the number of four.[15] Bonaparte now also despatched Augereau's division to invade the States of the Church.

[11] Botta, t. ii. lib. viii. p. 64.

[12] Bonaparte thus describes his own policy towards the Venetians: "Vénise nous a déjà fourni trois millions pour la nourriture de l'armée. Pour en tirer davantage je suis obligé de me fâcher contre le proveditеur, d'exagérer les assassinats qui se commettent contre nos troupes, de me plaindre amèrement de l'armément, et par là je les oblige à nous fournir, pour m'apaiser, tout ce qu'on voudra. Voilà comme il faut traiter avec ces gens-ci. Il n'y a pas au monde de gouvernement plus traître et plus lâche." *Lettre au Directoire, Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. i. p. 483.

[13] Martens, t. vi. p. 234.

[14] See his letter of October 2nd to the Directory, *Corr. de Napoleon I.* (Paris, 1859), t. ii. p. 32.

[15] Martens, *Ibid.*, p. 636.

The Bolognese had sent a deputation to Bonaparte at Milan, to solicit his aid in relieving them from the yoke of Rome, and restoring them to that liberty which they had acquired at the period of the Lombard League.[16] The French entered Bologna June 19th. Bonaparte, who was accompanied by the regicide Salicetti, the commissary of the French Government, published a manifesto on the 20th, declaring that the relations which had subsisted between Bologna and the Court of Rome since 1513 were at an end, and the sovereign power restored to the Bolognese Senate; the senators were to swear fidelity to the French Republic, and to exercise their authority in dependence upon it. This oath they accordingly took to Bonaparte, seated on a sort of throne in the *Sala Farnese*. But Bonaparte, as usual, imposed a heavy contribution on the city; and the inhabitants found to their surprise that they were treated rather as enemies than allies; a title with which the generalissimo had honoured the Republic of Bologna. He and Salicetti even laid their hands on the *Mont de Piété*, excepting only pledges of less value than 200 lire. But first of all, though surrounded by their victorious bands, they took the precaution to disarm the citizens.[17] Urbino, Ferrara, and Ravenna were next successively occupied by the French troops, and were also amerced in contributions. The Pope, now aged and infirm, and alarmed by the progress of the invaders, despatched the Chevalier Azara, the Spanish ambassador at Rome, to mediate for him with Bonaparte and Salicetti. He could not have placed his interests in worse hands. Spain, under the influence of Godoy, was sinking every day more and more into French vassalage. D'Azara delivered, as it were, the Pope and the Holy See bound into the hands of the young and imperious conqueror. It was only on very hard terms that a suspension of arms was granted. Pius VI. engaged to give satisfaction for the murder of Basseville in 1793; to liberate all persons confined for political opinions, to shut his ports against the vessels of Powers at war with France. The legations of Bologna and Ferrara were to continue in the occupation of the French troops, who were also to be put in possession of the citadel of Ancona; but Faenza was to be evacuated. The Pope was to deliver 100 pictures, busts, vases, or statues, to be selected by commissaries appointed for that purpose; in which were to be comprised the bronze bust of Junius Brutus, and the marble one of Marcus Brutus; also 500 manuscripts. He was further to pay 15,500,000 livres in money, and 5,500,000 in

[16] Botta, t. i. p. 444.

[17] *Ibid.* p. 446 sq.

merchandise, horses, &c., independently of the contributions of the legations; and he was to permit the passage of French troops through his territories.[18] In these negociations Bonaparte seems to have followed the instructions of the Directory, and to have disapproved himself, as at all events premature, the harsh treatment to which the Pope was subjected, on account of his vast moral influence, which would be exerted against France.[19]

While these negociations were going on with the Pope, Bonaparte, in violation of the Treaty of Paris, establishing the neutrality of Tuscany, despatched General Vaubois to take possession of Leghorn. All the English merchandise there was seized. Fortunately, however, the English merchants had obtained information of the approach of the French, and had shipped off the greater part of their goods. Bonaparte himself proceeded into Tuscany, and was entertained by the Grand Duke at Florence with almost royal honours. The rigid republicans observed that he already betrayed a disposition to familiarise himself with princes, and to extend his protection to them, as well as to the clergy and nobles. Salicetti, the Commissary of the Directory, by way of tacit reproof of Bonaparte, declined the Grand Duke's invitation. The English, in retaliation for the proceedings at Leghorn, landed 2000 troops at Porto Ferrajo, the capital of Elba, declaring that they should hold that island till the peace, to prevent its incurring the fate of Leghorn. The neutrality of Genoa was no more respected than that of the other Italian States. From the beginning of the year the French had pressed upon the Genoese a series of demands which they could not grant without incurring the resentment of the allies, and which were consequently refused. Among these demands was a secret loan of five million francs, for the immediate necessities of the French army; but the English minister at Turin, having received information of it, declared to the Genoese, that if it was granted their city would be bombarded by the English fleet, which was then blockading the Riviera. The French, after their victories, renewed their demands in a tone which showed they would take no refusal (June 21st); and the Senate, after long hesitating between the dangers which awaited them from the French armies on one side and the English fleet on the other, at length decided for the French. A treaty was concluded at Paris, October 9th 1796, by which the Genoese agreed to close their

[18] Martens, t. vi. p. 239.

[19] See his letter to the Directory, October 8th, *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. ii. p. 42. The Directory, in their correspondence with Bonaparte, did not even give the Pope his proper title, but called him the Prince of Rome, *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 482.

port against the English, to pay two million francs to the French, and to grant them a loan for a like sum.[20]

The ill success of General Beaulieu determined the Austrian Cabinet to supersede him by General Wurmser, who was then commanding the Austrian army on the Upper Rhine. At the time of Wurmser's recall the campaign in that quarter was on the point of commencing. The armistice had been terminated by the Austrians, who had given notice that hostilities were to begin on June 1st 1796. At this time the position of the opposing forces was as follows: Wurmser, with an army of 60,000 infantry and 20,000 cavalry, occupied the right bank of the Rhine from Basle to Mannheim, having its right wing extended on the opposite bank to Kaiserslautern in the Vosges mountains. Another Austrian army, under the Archduke Charles, which, including the contingents of some German princes and the garrisons of Mentz and Ehrenbreitstein, numbered 70,000 foot and 20,000 horse, was posted lower down the stream, between the rivers Sieg and Lahn. Moreau was opposed to Wurmser with the army of the Rhine, consisting of 70,000 foot and 6500 horse, cantoned along the left bank of the Rhine, from Hüningen to Germersheim in Alsace, and thence across the Vosges by Pirmasens to Hombourg. Over against the Archduke stood Jourdan with the army of the Sambre and Meuse, 65,000 infantry and 11,000 cavalry. The numerical superiority was therefore at first rather in favour of the Austrians; but this was lost the day before hostilities began by the departure of Wurmser for the Tyrol with 25,000 men. Wurmser was succeeded by Latour, and the command-in-chief of both armies was assumed by the Archduke Charles. That prince, now aged twenty-five, was destined to achieve in this campaign a military reputation only short of that of Bonaparte, his youthful competitor on the other side of the Alps.

We can give only a brief outline of the somewhat complicated German campaign of 1796.[21] The army of the Sambre and Meuse took the initiative by crossing the Rhine, Kléber on June 1st, and Jourdan on the 12th at Neuwied. The Germans in this quarter, under the Prince of Würtemberg, were driven back as far as Wetzlar, but here Jourdan was defeated by the Archduke Charles, June 15th, and compelled to recross the Rhine. Kléber, who

[20] Martens, t. vi. p. 252.

[21] The best sources for those who would study it are the Archduke Charles's own work, *Grundsätze der Strategie, erläutert durch die Darstellung des Feldzuges von* 1796, 3 B. 8vo.; Jourdan, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. de la campagne de* 1796; Marshal de St. Cyr-Gouvion, *Mém. sur les campagnes des armées du Rhin et de Rhin-et-Moselle, de* 1792 *jusqu'à la paix de Campo Formio.* 4 vols. 8vo.

covered his retreat, after engaging the Austrians under Kray at Uckerath and Kircheif, also repassed the Rhine.

Moreau crossed that river higher up, and seized the fort of Kehl, June 25th. The Archduke, leaving Wartensleben between the Lahn and Sieg with 36,000 men to oppose Jourdan, hastened with the remainder of his army to the aid of Latour, but, being defeated by Moreau in an engagement at Malsch, July 9th, retreated to Pforzheim. Meanwhile Jourdan had again crossed the Rhine and driven Wartensleben beyond Frankfort. Hence that general continued his retreat by way of Würtzburg to Amberg, August 18th, with the view of covering the magazines in Bohemia, thus separating himself more and more from the Archduke, and rendering the latter's situation still more difficult. Charles continued his retreat along the right bank of the Necker pursued by Moreau, and on July 21st there was some fighting at Cannstadt and Esslingen.

At this crisis of the campaign the Archduke was suddenly deserted by some of the princes of the Empire with their contingents. The Duke of Würtemberg, the Margrave of Baden, and the petty princes of the Circle of Suabia, on the invasion of their territories by Moreau, separated their forces from the army of the Confederation, and obtained from the French general, by heavy contributions, a suspension of arms.

At the same time the perfidious Cabinet of Berlin took advantage of the dangers and misfortunes of the German Fatherland to push its own interests. The advance of the French, which seemed to threaten both Empire and Emperor with destruction, and which might have been averted had the Prussians acted with loyalty as members of the Confederation, was employed by them to draw closer their connection with France. On August 5th, as the French armies were penetrating into Franconia and Bavaria, two treaties, one patent, the other secret, were signed at Berlin with the French minister Caillard. The first of these treaties modified the neutral line established by the Treaty of Basle. The new line comprised Lower Saxony and the greater part of the Circle of Westphalia. The States included in it were to withdraw their contingents from the Imperial army and cease their contributions for the war, and the King of Prussia was to assemble an army of observation to guarantee the line of neutrality.[22] The secret treaty was still more important. By this, Frederick William II. agreed not to oppose the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to the

[22] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 359.

French, and that the temporal princes who might suffer from this arrangement should be indemnified by the secularisation of ecclesiastical domains in Germany. To the King of Prussia himself was to be assigned the Bishopric of Münster, with the district of Rechlinghausen by way of compensation for his trans-Rhenane provinces. That part of the Bishopric on the left bank of the Ems was to be united to the Batavian Republic. The House of Hesse was also to be indemnified by secularisations, and the branch of Cassel was to be elevated to the electoral dignity. If, at the future pacification, the re-establishment of the House of Orange in the Stadtholderate should be deemed inadmissible, the French Republic was to use its influence to procure for the Prince of Orange the secularised Bishoprics of Würtzburg and Bamberg, also with the electoral dignity. In case the Prince should die without male issue, the Bishoprics were to devolve to the House of Brandenburg.[23] The Elector and the other States of Upper Saxony, whose territories were not included in the neutral line, now hastened by the Treaty of Erlangen, August 13th, under the mediation of Prussia, to accede to the neutrality. The line of demarcation was extended so as to include the Bishopric of Fulda, the County of Henneberg, Upper Saxony, and Lusatia, and the Elector undertook to defend it with 20,000 men.[24] The Saxon contingent was now also withdrawn from the Imperial army. The Diet of the Empire, assembled at Ratisbon, trembling for their safety, had also sent to General Jourdan to negociate the neutrality of that place, and informed him that they had urged the Emperor to take measures for a peace. But Jourdan declared that he had no power in the matter, and referred them to the Directory.[25]

Prussia, by making concessions to France for which she was to be indemnified at the expense of the Empire, not only ruined the German cause, but also placed herself at the mercy of the French Government in a future settlement. Thus was initiated that selfish and fatal policy which resulted in depriving fifty millions of the German name of their proper weight in the European balance. The English Cabinet viewed her proceedings with alarm. Pitt despatched Mr. Hammond to Berlin to persuade that Cabinet to resort to an *armed* mediation between the belligerents. But Hammond, who arrived at Berlin five days after the conclusion of the treaty, found Haugwitz inexorable and imperturbable; nor

[23] This secret treaty was betrayed by the French foreign minister himself in his negociations with Lord Malmesbury in the following October, by way of proof that Prussia did not insist upon the left bank of the Rhine. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. S. 366.

[24] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 360.

[25] *Politisches Journal*, 1796, S. 915; Menzel, B. vi. S. 350.

did he succeed any better in an interview with Frederick William himself.[26]

On the appearance of the French in Franconia, the Council of Nuremberg sent deputies to their headquarters at Würtzburg, who signed there a Convention of neutrality, August 7th; and two days after, when the French troops arrived at Nuremberg, they were received and quartered as friends. But they had scarcely entered the town when they began to purchase goods for which they tendered *assignats*, then worthless even in France; they demanded clothing and provisions to the amount of 550,000 Rhenish gulden, and a war contribution of two and a half million francs. The commander-in-chief, alleging that he had not ratified the Convention signed by a subordinate officer, ordered the town to be treated as a party in the war of the Empire, and as a conquered place! The inhabitants being unable to raise the sums demanded, the French carried off nineteen of the principal of them as hostages.

The Archduke Charles, whose army had been reduced to 25,000 men by the desertions of the Imperial contingents, gave battle to Moreau at Neresheim, August 11th. The result was indecisive, but it enabled him to cross to the right bank of the Danube, down which he advanced, with the intention of aiding Wartensleben, whom Jourdan had driven beyond the Naab. Moreau was marching on the opposite side of the Danube. Latour, with 30,000 men, including Condé's corps of French emigrants, was posted on the Lech, which they occupied from Landsberg to Rain. The Archduke, having ordered Latour not to risk a battle, but to retire on the approach of Moreau, who had crossed the Danube at Donauwerth, continued his march down the right bank of that river, which he crossed at Ingolstadt, August 17th. Having formed a junction with Wartensleben, he defeated Bernadotte's division at Neumarkt, August 22nd, and again, on the 23rd, at Teiningen. He was now on Jourdan's right flank, whose headquarters were at Amberg, and whom he attacked and defeated, August 24th. The French general now retreated to Schweinfurt, and the Archduke marched to Würtzburg. As this movement threatened Jourdan's communications with Frankfort, he attacked the Austrians at Kornach, near Würtzburg, September 3rd; but, Wartensleben having come up, the French were entirely defeated. Jourdan now commenced a precipitate and disorderly retreat by way of Gmunden and Hammelburg to the Lahn, during which his troops

[26] *Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 400.

suffered severely at the hands of the enraged peasantry, who had organised themselves into regular bands, with cavalry. After some affairs between the Lahn and Sieg, the army of the Sambre and Meuse, now under the command of Beurnonville, by whom Jourdan had been superseded, September 22nd, recrossed the Rhine.

Meanwhile the Archduke Charles was threatened by a danger which he had not anticipated. Latour, instead of obeying his orders, had attempted to arrest Moreau's progress, and had suffered a crushing defeat at Friedberg, August 24th, the day of Charles' victory at Amberg. Latour now retreated on Munich, followed by Moreau. On the approach of the French the Elector of Bavaria fled to Saxony, and the Bavarian States, in the Elector's name, hastened to conclude an armistice with the victorious general, September 7th, by which they agreed to withdraw the Bavarian contingent, to allow free passage to the French, to pay ten million francs, deliver 3300 horses, 200,000 quintals of corn, the same quantity of hay, 100,000 pairs of shoes, 10,000 pairs of boots, 30,000 ells of cloth, and twenty pictures to be selected from the Elector's galleries.[27] But a fortunate turn in the campaign speedily relieved the Elector from this onerous agreement. Latour had been driven beyond the Great Laber when Moreau, hearing of Jourdan's misfortunes, which placed him in a critical position, commenced his famous retreat, September 11th. He was pursued by Latour; Nauendorf, with an Austrian division, was in Ulm; while Charles, with part of his forces, threatened his line of retreat. Moreau's path lay through the Black Forest, which, though beset by Austrian troops, he chose in preference to violating the neutral Swiss territory. To disembarrass himself of Latour before Charles could come up, he attacked and defeated the former general at Biberach, October 2nd, and threaded the narrow and dangerous pass of the Höllenthal without molestation, though pursued by the Archduke. Having emerged into the valley of the Rhine, he engaged the Austrians at Emmendingen, October 19th, and at Schliengen, October 24th, in the hope of maintaining himself on the right bank of the Rhine; but, being worsted in both actions, he re-crossed that river at Hüningen, October 26th. An armistice was now agreed upon between the Austrians and the army of the Sambre and Meuse. The French abandoned the *tête-du-pont* of Neuwied and the right bank of the Rhine from that place to Mulheim, and went into winter quarters. Moreau also proposed an armistice to the

[27] Martens, t. vi. p. 294.

Archduke on condition of retaining Kehl and the *tête-du-pont* of Hüningen. Charles was willing to enter into an arrangement which would have enabled him to despatch a large part of his forces to the relief of Mantua, now besieged by the French, but he received directions from Vienna to retake Kehl at whatever cost. It was not till January 9th 1797 that Kehl surrendered by capitulation, while the *tête-du-pont* of Hüningen held out till February 2nd. The Cabinet of Vienna attained its object, but Mantua fell.

Wurmser, who had taken the command of the Austrian army in the Tyrol early in July, was also prevented from pursuing his own plans for the relief of Mantua. The Aulic Council of War, by directing him to divide his forces, marred all his efforts. Agreeably to their instructions, Wurmser having advanced his headquarters to Trent, divided his army into three columns. One of these, under Quosdanovich, was to march by the western shore of the Lago di Garda on Brescia; another, under Meszaroz, proceeded by the eastern side of the lake; while Wurmser himself, with the main body, marched straight upon Mantua. The operations of Quosdanovich were attended with success. He seized Salo and Brescia, and advancing thence on the road to Mantua, threatened the French rear. Wurmser at first was no less successful. By July 31st he had forced all the French posts upon the Adige, and was in full march upon Mantua. Bonaparte, thus placed between two fires, was preparing to retire beyond the Adda, when Augereau is said to have counselled him to raise the siege and direct all his forces against Quosdanovich. The Austrian general was thus crushed by a superior force at Lonato, August 3rd, and compelled to regain the defiles of the Tyrol, while Brescia and Salo were recovered by the French. Having struck this blow, Bonaparte immediately turned, with 28,000 men, against Wurmser, who had only 18,000, attacked him, August 5th, near Castiglione, and, after a series of combats, which lasted five days, completely defeated him, with great loss of prisoners and guns. Wurmser was now compelled to retire to Trent with the shattered remains of his army. The absence of the French had enabled him to revictual Mantua, but after his defeat they resumed the siege of that place.

Bonaparte was now instructed by the Directory to force Wurmser's positions in the Tyrol, and to form a junction with Moreau, who, as we have seen, was at this period victoriously advancing.[28] Moreau's right wing having seized, at this period, the important

[28] Bonaparte himself has given a different account of these circumstances; but see the *Mém. d'un Homme d'état*, t. iii. p. 444.

position of Bregentz, was about to enter the Tyrol, and the Directory dreamt for a moment of realising the vast plan by which they were to unite their armies in the heart of Germany, a hope speedily dissipated by the defeat of Jourdan and consequent retreat of Moreau. Wurmser, on his side, undismayed by the posture of affairs, having rallied his scattered forces and received reinforcements which brought up his army to 50,000 men, had resolved on another attempt to relieve Mantua. Thus both he and Bonaparte advanced simultaneously in the pursuit of entirely separate and independent objects. Wurmser marched by the Val Sugana towards Bassano, whilst Bonaparte took the direct road to Trent, which place he entered September 5th, after defeating, the day before, at Roveredo, an Austrian division of 25,000 men, commanded by Davidowich. The news of this disaster did not arrest the march of Wurmser, who, on the contrary, pushed on more rapidly towards Bassano. Bonaparte was now in an embarrassing position. To advance further into the Tyrol would be to abandon all Italy to the enemy; he therefore resolved to retrace his steps. Advancing against Wurmser by forced marches, he surprised and captured nearly all his advanced guard at Primolano, and entirely defeated Wurmser himself before Bassano, September 8th. The Austrian general had now no resource but to throw himself into Mantua. During this retreat he suffered great losses in several battles, the last of these being at St. Giorgio, a suburb of Mantua, September 15th, after which he entered that place with from 12,000 to 15,000 men. The siege was now resumed by Bonaparte, who, on learning the retreat of Moreau, abandoned for the present the thought of penetrating into Austria.

The Austrians were not, however, discouraged. A third army of 50,000 men was formed, commanded by Alvinzi and Davidowich. Alvinzi passed the Piave, November 1st, with 30,000 men, defeated Bonaparte on the 6th in a pitched battle at Bassano, and again at Caldiero on the 12th, and compelled him to retreat upon Verona. Bonaparte was in a state of discouragement, almost of despair. Fortunately Davidowich and his division, whom Alvinzi had detached with directions to advance along the course of the Upper Adige, made no movement at this critical juncture, and thus enabled Bonaparte to direct all his forces against Alvinzi. On the evening of November 14th, crossing the Adige at Verona with his army, as if in full retreat, he suddenly turned to the left, and pursuing his march down the right bank of the river, recrossed it at Ronco, with the intention of turning Alvinzi's position. The French assaulted the Austrian entrenchments at Arcole during

three successive days, November 15th, 16th, and 17th, with great loss on both sides. Bonaparte himself was precipitated with his horse into the marshes, and was in imminent danger of being killed or made prisoner, when he was rescued by his grenadiers. On the third day Alvinzi began his retreat to Vicenza, disregarding the remonstrances of his bravest and most devoted officers, who urged him to effect a junction with Davidowich and to march upon Verona, which would have received him with open arms.

Meanwhile Davidowich, advancing along the Adige, after gaining several advantages over the French, especially at La Pietra, November 7th, and at Rivoli, 17th, had succeeded in penetrating to Castel Nuovo, near Peschiera; but at the approach of Bonaparte, who now hastened against him with his victorious army, he was compelled to retreat. Thus the Austrians again lost the campaign by the injudicious plan of dividing their forces.

In January 1797 Alvinzi, who had received large reinforcements, made, at the summons of Wurmser, a last attempt to deliver Mantua. Despatching General Provera with 12,000 men towards Ponte Legnano on the Lower Adige, he himself transported his headquarters to Roveredo, on the Upper Adige. From these places both generals were to pursue their march to Mantua and form a junction at that town. Provera was successful over Augereau's division, and compelled that general to retreat on Bevilacqua and thence on Ponte Legnano, January 9th. Alvinzi, on his side, after some hard fighting, drove the French under Joubert from their entrenchments at La Corona (January 13th), who then retired to Rivoli. Bonaparte, who was at Bologna, at the news of the Austrian advance flew to the scene of action, and on January 14th defeated Alvinzi in a decisive battle at Rivoli; which the Austrian general, unaware of the arrival of Bonaparte with reinforcements, had advanced to attack. On the following day, Joubert completed, at La Corona, Alvinzi's discomfiture, while Bonaparte, with the greater part of his victorious army, marched in pursuit of Provera. That general had arrived at Mantua, and by concert with Wurmser was preparing to attack the suburbs of San Giorgio and La Favorite, held by the French, when he found himself surrounded by the troops of Bonaparte and of Augereau, and was compelled to lay down his arms (January 16th). These disasters proved fatal to the Austrian power in Italy. Mantua surrendered by capitulation February 2nd. The garrison had long been on short allowance, but it was not till tobacco began to fail that the troops showed any symptoms of discontent. The commandant, Canto d'Yrles, a Spaniard, was so confident of the

temper of his soldiers and the strength of the fortress, that it was with the greatest reluctance he had admitted Wurmser; and there can be no doubt that the necessity of providing for so many additional mouths accelerated the fall of the place. It has been thought by good military authorities that, with a garrison of from 12,000 to 15,000 men, with provisions and medicines for two years, Mantua might be defended against an army of 100,000 men.[29]

France had strengthened herself by an offensive and defensive alliance with Spain, which secured to her the aid of that Power, but, during the present war, only against England. Spain, since the affair of Toulon, conceived that she had some grievances against England; a feeling which the French Government used all their endeavours to inflame. They also cajoled and flattered the vain, insolent, and greedy favourite Godoy, who, at this time, ruled supreme in Spain. It is difficult to divine his motives for the French alliance. He neither liked the French people nor their revolution; while his sovereign must have viewed with horror and disgust a Government which had murdered or expelled the elder branch of his family. The Treaty of St. Ildefonso, concluded by Godoy with the French Directory, August 19th 1796, was modelled on the *Family Compact* of 1761. Its object was to render the wars of one Power common to both; or, in other words, under present circumstances, to place the resources of Spain at the disposal of France. Each Power agreed to provide the other, at three months' notice, with fifteen ships of the line, six frigates, and four smaller vessels; and with 18,000 infantry, 6000 cavalry and artillery in proportion. The eighteenth article of the treaty is the most remarkable and important, being virtually a declaration of war against Great Britain. This article stated that England being the only country against which Spain had any direct complaints, the present alliance should be valid solely against her during the actual war, and that Spain should remain neuter with regard to other Powers at war with the French Republic.[30]

After the execution of this treaty the English and Spanish ministers were reciprocally withdrawn; and the Spaniards prepared to lay siege to Gibraltar. The manifest of Spain against Great Britain, containing her alleged grievances, appeared October 6th. They were mostly futile, and even, if true, no ground for war.[31] Among them was the arrest of the Spanish ambassador at London, against whom an execution for debt had been issued by an

[29] See note in Garden, t. v. p. 386.
[30] Martens, t. vi. p. 255.
[31] See Garden, t. v. p. 365.

ignorant magistrate, who had been disavowed by the Government, and had made the most humble apologies.

Soon after the declaration of war, a Spanish fleet of twenty-four sail of the line proceeded to Toulon; when Admiral Jarvis, the English commander in the Mediterranean, being now no longer strong enough to blockade that port, was directed to carry off the British troops at Corsica, Elba, and Caprera, and to quit the Mediterranean. This was the principal motive with the Court of Naples for making peace with France. Bonaparte, after his expedition to Leghorn, had through his emissaries excited an insurrection in Corsica against the English, and before the end of October the French regained possession of that island.

The French and Spanish alliance, as well as mistrust of Austria, which seemed to be retained in the Coalition only through fear of Russia, were probably the principal motives which induced Pitt to attempt negociations with France for a peace. Seizing the opportunity of Jourdan's defeat at Amberg, Lord Grenville addressed a note, September 6th, to M. Charles Delacroix, the French foreign minister, which was conveyed to him through the Danish ambassador at Paris. The French Government having captiously refused to treat, except directly, Lord Grenville, encouraged by the Archduke Charles's further victories, sent another note, September 25th, by a parlementary direct to Paris, when passports were forwarded for Lord Malmesbury, the English plenipotentiary, and the persons in his suite. The Directory appear at this period to have been sincerely desirous of peace, at least with Austria. Their situation was by no means secure. They were threatened at once by the remains of the Jacobin party and by the Royalists; several conspiracies had been organised against them; they had found it necessary to establish camps in the neighbourhood of Paris, and to banish all suspected persons from that capital. One of the most formidable of these conspiracies was that of Francis Noel Babœuf, a journalist and ultra-democrat, who had assumed the name of Caius Gracchus Babœuf. In conjunction with Drouet, the celebrated postmaster, and other persons, Babœuf had plotted an armed insurrection (May 1796); but his design having come to the knowledge of the Directory, he and the other leaders were seized before they could execute it. Babœuf was ultimately condemned by the High Court of Vendôme, and stabbed himself on hearing his sentence of death. The reverses of the French armies in Germany had produced a painful impression on the public mind, which was aggravated by the distressed state of the country, and loud cries had arisen for peace. Under these circumstances,

the Directory had instructed Bonaparte to make overtures to the Emperor; who accordingly addressed from Milan an insolent letter to Francis, October 2nd, in which he threatened that monarch with the destruction of Trieste and the ruin of all the Austrian establishments on the Adriatic, unless he immediately despatched plenipotentiaries to Paris.[32] This communication was treated by the Emperor with silent contempt.

Lord Malmesbury arrived in Paris October 21st, and was received with lively demonstrations of public joy. But the Directory, as their conduct soon showed, did not wish a peace with England. Their policy was to isolate that Power by concluding a separate treaty with Austria, and to continue the war against it with the aid of Spain. The English plenipotentiary was treated with open insult by the Government, while General Clarke, an Irishman in the service of France, was despatched to Vienna by way of Italy to make another attempt at negociation. Thugut was inclined for a separate peace with France; but the English ambassador, Sir Morton Eden, persuaded the Emperor not to separate his cause from that of England, and Clarke's passports were refused. Clarke had only some interviews with the Austrian generals in Italy. But, even if the Cabinet of Vienna had been disposed to receive him, the jealousy of Bonaparte, who was indignant at seeing the matter taken out of his hands, and who already began to entertain a contempt for the authority of the Directory, would never have allowed him to proceed.[33]

The Austrian Cabinet now communicated to that of England their views with regard to the negociations at Paris; and on the 17th December Lord Malmesbury presented to the French Government an *ultimatum* drawn up in conformity with them. England agreed to restore to France all her conquests in the East and West Indies, on condition of the restitution of the Emperor's possessions on the same footing as before the war, of peace with the Empire, and of the evacuation of Italy by the French troops, coupled with an engagement not to interfere in the domestic affairs of that country. But the French Government refused to restore the Austrian Netherlands, a point which the English and Austrian Cabinets made a *sine quâ non*. Delacroix insisted, that the Netherlands having been annexed to France by a legislative decree, it would be *unconstitutional*, and out of the power of the

[32] *Corr. de Napoléon I.*, t. ii. p. 34.

[33] Bonaparte told Clarke, in one of his communications: "Si vous venez faire ma volonté, je vous verrai avec plaisir; sinon, vous pouvez retourner vers ceux qui vous envoient." Clarke (continues Hardenberg) "ne répondit mot, et il se mit a réfléchir sur le caractère et les vues du général en chef." *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 133.

Directory, to give them back: thus making the law of France override the law of nations. The Directory declined to offer any counter-scheme of their own; and on December 19th Lord Malmesbury was directed to leave Paris in forty-eight hours. The death of the Empress Catherine II., already recorded, on November 17th, just as she was on the point of signing the Triple Alliance, had an effect on these negociations unfavourable to the Coalition.[34] Paul I., as we have said, adopted a different line of policy, and revoked the *ukase* which had been issued for a general levy. It was foreseen that the consequences of Catherine's death would be a freer exercise on the part of Prussia of its self-interested and partial neutrality, and a more complete isolation of Austria on the continent.

The Punic faith of the Directory was proved by their urging on during these negociations the preparation of an armament destined for a descent upon Ireland. The French fleet sailed from Brest December 15th, two days before Lord Malmesbury delivered his *ultimatum*. The Directory had used their authority over the Batavian Republic, now a mere appendage of France, to fit out another fleet for the same purpose in the Texel. The disastrous result of this expedition is well known to the English reader. Part of the vessels of the French armament arrived in Bantry Bay, the remainder were dispersed by storms. Among these last was the frigate conveying General Hoche, the commander of the troops of debarcation, in whose absence the French admiral refused to land them. Contrary to expectation, the Irish showed themselves hostile to the invasion, and the expedition was compelled to return, after suffering considerable losses both from the weather and by capture. The naval actions and colonial affairs of 1796 were not of much importance. A squadron, despatched by the Dutch for the recovery of the Cape of Good Hope, was captured in August by Admiral Elphinstone in Saldanha Bay, about thirty leagues from the Cape. In the West Indies, St. Lucia and St. Vincent's were taken by the English, but their attempt on St. Domingo failed. We now return to the affairs of Italy.

Bonaparte had scarcely dictated the terms of the capitulation of Mantua when he announced to Pope Pius VI. the termination of the armistice of Bologna (February 1st 1797), and marched with his troops in the direction of that city, while General Victor, with his division, was ordered to enter the Romagna. After the con-

[34] The advantages which the French promised themselves from the accession of Paul are explained in Delacroix's letter to Clarke, December 30th 1796. *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 135. But their hopes were not altogether realised.

clusion of that armistice in June 1796, Pius VI. had sent two plenipotentiaries to Paris to treat for a peace; but the bases proposed by the Directory were so unreasonable that the Papal Ministers declined to adopt them, and were ordered to leave Paris (August 1796). It is said to have been proposed that the Pope should sanction the constitutional oath of the French clergy, surrender to France for ever the possession of Cività Vecchia and Ancona, pay a tribute for Charlemagne's donations, &c. &c.[35] Negociations were afterwards renewed at Florence with no better success. The Pope then prepared for war; increased his army to upwards of 40,000 men, which he intrusted to the command of the Piedmontese General Colli; and entered into negociations for an alliance with the Court of Vienna. The expedition of the French into the States of the Church was, however, little more than a military promenade. The Papal troops entrenched behind the Senio were routed on the first attack; Faenza, Forlì, Cesena were successively entered; Bonaparte in person proceeded to Urbino and Ancona, whence, despatching a detachment to occupy Loretto, he took the road to Rome by Macerata and Tolentino.

After the fall of Mantua, Pius, to whom and his prelates Bonaparte appeared another Alaric or Attila—and, indeed, some parts of his conduct might justify a comparison between him and those warlike barbarians—had sent to propitiate the conqueror and sue for peace. At the news of his approach, the Pope solicited an armistice, when the French general required him to dismiss his newly levied troops and foreign commanders, and accorded him the space of five days to send plenipotentiaries to Tolentino. The Directory had invited Bonaparte to effect the entire destruction of the Papal Government, which had always shown itself the implacable foe of the Republic.[36] But Bonaparte did not share the rabid hatred of the Pentarchs for the Holy See, and there were circumstances which induced him to come to terms with it. The Austrians were preparing another army; the King of the Two Sicilies had sent a message that he should not behold with indifference the French advance upon Rome, nor consent that conditions should be imposed upon the Pope that were contrary to religion and the existing Papal Government. Bonaparte agreed upon the Peace of Tolentino with the Pope's envoys, February 19th. The See of Rome withdrew from all leagues against the French Republic, ceded to it Avignon and the Venaissin, and the Legations of Bologna, Ferrara, and the Romagna; and accorded to

[35] See Schirach, *Polit. Journal*, 1796, p. 1066, ap. Garden, t. v. p. 388 note.

[36] *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 181. (Letter of the Directory to Bonaparte.)

it the possession of Ancona till a Continental pacification should be effected. Besides, the pecuniary contributions stipulated in the armistice of Bologna, of which only a part had been liquidated, the Pope was to pay fifteen millions more in cash, diamonds, or other valuable effects. The contributions in objects of art and manuscripts remained the same. The Pope was to disavow the assassination of Basseville, the French ambassador at Rome.[37] Thus the Holy See purchased a peace by sacrificing more than a year's revenue and a third part of its temporal dominions. After thus mulcting the Pope, Bonaparte concluded these transactions by addressing to him a most respectful letter, in which he expressed his veneration for the Holy Father in terms quite at variance with the spirit of his instructions from the Directory, and such as might have become the most devout son of the Church.[38] A little previously, the Grand Duke of Tuscany had been compelled to purchase a confirmation of his neutrality, and a promise that the French would evacuate Leghorn.[39]

After the conclusion of the Peace of Tolentino, Bonaparte sent a message to the little Republic of S. Marino, the oldest in Italy after Venice, offering it an augmentation of territory. The Gonfalonier wisely declined the dangerous honour; and this small state, consisting of only 6000 souls, preserved its independence through all the convulsions of Europe.

Thus in less than a twelvemonth Bonaparte had conquered Piedmont and reduced the King of Sardinia to an ignominious peace; had subdued Lombardy and Mantua; destroyed four Austrian armies; detached the King of Naples, as well as Parma and Tuscany, from the Coalition; laid Venice and Genoa under contribution; deprived the Pope of a third part of his dominions; and occupied all the north of Italy to the Piave. He could boast that he had not only supported his army during eleven months, and handsomely rewarded his generals, officers, and soldiers, but had also been able to send thirty million francs to France.

But notwithstanding Bonaparte's rapid and brilliant conquests, the main object of the war, the compelling of the Emperor to make peace, still remained unaccomplished. To attempt such a task required all Bonaparte's genius and good fortune. The physical obstacles to a march from Italy to Vienna, if properly taken advantage of by the Austrians, seemed almost insuperable. The resources of the Emperor were far from being exhausted. His hereditary dominions displayed an enthusiastic loyalty. The

[37] Garden, t. v. p. 390.
[38] *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. ii. p. 347.
[39] Garden, t. v. p. 392.

Hungarian Diet assembled at Presburg, elected the Archduke Joseph to the vacant dignity of Palatine, voted a considerable subsidy in money, extraordinary supplies in kind, a large levy of recruits, and an *insurrection* of the nobles, on a scale so extensive that the cavalry alone amounted to 24,000 sabres. Bohemia and the Tyrol accorded a *levée en masse*.[40] The Archduke Charles, whose campaign in Germany had inspired the greatest confidence in his military abilities, was appointed generalissimo of the Austrian forces. But the Emperor's resources could only be made slowly available, a fatal defect in the face of so active and enterprising a general as Bonaparte. Scarce had he returned from Tolentino, when he resolved at once to open the campaign without waiting for the spring, and to strike a blow before the Austrians could receive their new levies and drafts from the army on the Rhine. He had been reinforced by the divisions of Bernadotte and Dehmas and a treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, was in progress with Charles Emmanuel IV., by which he was to receive the aid of a considerable body of Piedmontese troops.[41] The French had also been recruited from the conquered districts of Italy. To an army of 45,000 men, inured to service and flushed with victory, the Archduke could oppose only about 24,000 troops in a state of disorganisation and discouragement. Faults were also committed in the conduct of the campaign. Had the Archduke Charles concentrated his forces in the Tyrol he might have easily prevented the French from penetrating through those difficult passes, while at the same time Bonaparte would probably have been deterred from taking the route of the Julian and Noric Alps, for fear of seeing his communications intercepted, and himself attacked in the rear. Instead of this, by direction of the Aulic Council, and, it is said, by the designed treachery of Thugut and the peace-party in the Austrian councils,[42] he assembled the main body of his army in the Friuli, and exposed it to the attacks of the French in a long and feeble line on the Tagliamento. The Austrians were driven from their position at Valvassone, on that river, at the first attack, March 16th, in which action Bernadotte particularly distinguished himself. The Archduke now retreated beyond the Isonzo. Bonaparte, in close pursuit, left him no time to cover Trieste, drove him through Gradisca and Görtz beyond the Save. Bernadotte was despatched to seize Trieste, which he entered, March 24th. On the 23rd Masséna, with the French

[40] Mailath, *Gesch. des Oestr. Kaiserstaates*, B. v. S. 218.

[41] Signed at Turin, April 8th 1797. Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 620.

[42] *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 234 sqq.

advanced guard, had defeated the Austrians after some brilliant actions at Tarvis. The Drave was now passed, and Bonaparte entered Klagenfurt, the capital of Carinthia, March 31st, which had been taken by Masséna, after a smart action two days before; while Bernadotte entered Laybach, the capital of Carniola, April 1st.

But the situation of Bonaparte, however brilliant, was attended with considerable danger. The Directory had informed him that he could expect no timely aid by the advance of the French armies on the Rhine. He found himself in the midst of a hostile population, advancing further and further from his base of operations; while the Archduke, as he receded, drew nearer to his supports. The Hungarian *insurrection* had begun to march. General Joubert, who had penetrated to Botzen in the Tyrol, was there threatened by the Tyrolese *levée en masse*, under Count Lehrbach, and compelled to retreat. At several places in the Venetian territories the inhabitants had risen against the French. Bonaparte was alarmed about the intentions of the Venetian Government itself. The Senate, annoyed by the seizure of Bergamo by General Baraguay d'Hilliers (December 25th 1796), had silently made considerable armaments; had assembled near Venice a corps of 12,000 Dalmatians, the best troops of the Republic; and had entered into secret negociations with the Court of Vienna, which could not have altogether escaped the knowledge of the French. Bonaparte had extorted from the Republic a subsidy of one million a month, telling them that they might seize the treasures of the Duke of Modena, who was an enemy of France. The manner in which he expressed himself to Pesaro, one of their commissaries who attended him on his march, betrays the anxiety which he felt regarding Venice; which, indeed, by rising against him at this juncture might have done him irreparable damage. Seizing Pesaro by the arm, he exclaimed that there could no longer be any medium; that if Venice resorted to arms, either she or the army of Italy was lost; exhorted him not to expose the valetudinary lion of St. Mark.[43] A few more days, and Bonaparte might probably be cut off from Italy, deprived of the means of maintaining his army, and compelled perhaps to attempt a retreat by way of Saltzburg, which would have been attended with the greatest difficulties. His alarm, in fact, was so great that he addressed a letter from Klagenfurt to the Archduke Charles (March 31st), with proposals for peace. This celebrated letter is a

[43] Daru, *Hist. de Vénise*, liv. xxxvii. § 30.

chef-d'œuvre of hypocrisy. He asked with affected philanthropy whether it was necessary that they should go on cutting one another's throats to serve the interests or the passions of a nation that was herself exempt from the evils of war? (England.) And he concluded by saying that, if he could save the life of a single man he should feel prouder of the civic crown, which he should thus have merited, than of all the melancholy glory which attends the conqueror![44]

Bonaparte did not, however, arrest his march. He pressed on by St. Veit and Neumarkt, where a bloody battle occurred, to Judenburg in Styria, the Archduke retreating before him. At Judenburg, only a few days' march from Vienna, an armistice was agreed upon, April 7th, which was followed, eleven days after, by the signature of the preliminaries of a peace at Léoben. Vienna had been seized with a panic terror at the approach of the French; and Bonaparte's proposal, contrary to the advice of the Archduke Charles, had been joyfully accepted. The truce was extended to the Tyrol, where the French were now in full retreat; and thus, at a moment when the advance of the Austrians and Tyrolese would have supported a rising against the French in the Venetian States. It is unnecessary here to detail the preliminaries of Léoben, signed April 18th, the articles of which were either confirmed or set aside by the definitive Peace of Campo Formio six months afterwards. They were drawn up with the assistance, but not under the mediation, of the Marquis S. Gallo, Neapolitan ambassador at Vienna.[45] It will suffice to state that the main outline of them was the cession to France of the Austrian Netherlands, the consent of the Emperor to her occupation of the left bank of the Rhine and of Savoy, and to the establishment of a Cisalpine Republic in Italy, Austria relinquishing all her possessions beyond the Oglio; for which sacrifices the Emperor was to be compensated with the continental states of Venice, while that Republic was to receive the possessions wrested from the Pope by the Peace of Tolentino. Thus Austria disgraced herself by deserting Great Britain and making a separate peace, contrary to the solemn assurances of Thugut to the English ambassador only a few days before;[46] as well as by accepting the spoils of Venice, a friendly, or, at all events, a neutral Power, in compensation of her own losses. The Austrians had tried to make a merit of acknow-

[44] *Corr. de Napoléon I.*, t. ii. p. 436.

[45] The preliminaries of Léoben were long kept secret. The articles which differ from the Treaty of Campo Formio will be found in Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. v. p. 398 sq.

[46] *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 254.

ledging, in a first article, the French Republic; but Bonaparte struck it out, exclaiming: "The Republic is like the sun; woe to those who cannot see it!"

Hoche, with the army of the Sambre and Meuse, had passed the Rhine at Neuwied, April 18th, and, driving the Austrians before him, reached Giessen on the Lahn, after gaining several battles and marching thirty-five leagues in five days. Moreau, with the army of the Rhine, passed that river on the 21st at Kehl, in face of the enemy drawn up in order of battle; one of the most brilliant passages on record. He made 4000 prisoners and retook the fort at Kehl; but an armistice concluded June 23rd, in conformity with the preliminaries of Léoben, arrested further hostilities in this quarter.

Bonaparte, in his first overtures to Austria, had not demanded the cession of Lombardy, having no equivalent to offer in return, and fearing that without it the Emperor would never consent to a separate peace; but before the signature of the preliminaries of Léoben events had occurred which, if they did not justify, might at all events serve to colour and excuse, the spoliation of Venice, and thus provide the desired indemnity. A manifest had appeared, dated at Verona, March 20th, and purporting to be signed by Battaglia, the Venetian *proveditore* in the Terra Firma, calling on the people to rise against the French, promising them aid from the Government, and representing the French armies, both in the Tyrol and the Friuli, as completely beaten. There is every reason to believe that this manifest was a forgery. It was disavowed both by Battaglia and by the Venetian Government, and is suspected to have been manufactured by the French themselves or their agents, in order to afford Bonaparte tangible ground of complaint against Venice. Be this as it may, the Italian peasantry, exasperated against the French soldiery, rose and massacred a considerable number of them. In Venice itself demonstrations were made against the French, which were secretly encouraged by three Inquisitors of State, and were also favoured by Drake, the English minister, who appeared in public with the Venetian cockade and badge. The Venetian Government, however, sent two senators, Dona and Contarini, to Bonaparte's headquarters to disavow these proceedings, and to protest their fidelity and submission. Bonaparte replied by despatching his aide-de-camp Junot from Judenburg, April 9th, with a letter to the Doge, Louis Manini, in which he contemptuously repudiated the disavowal of that magistrate. In the same strain he threatened to avenge his brothers in arms; demanded, categorically, peace or war. This letter Junot read

before the Doge and his council, whom, contrary to their custom, he had compelled to assemble on a Sunday, with a tone and manner which aggravated its insulting contents. The Government, whose want of energy was still more conspicuous than its want of power, again humbly protested its submission, and promised to punish those who had been guilty of the assassinations. Unfortunately, however, the insurrection had gone on increasing, and had extended to Verona itself. The French garrison in that town consisted of only about 1300 men, exclusive of the sick, while the Venetian Government had assembled there, besides Italian troops, and a considerable force outside the town, a body of 2000 Slavonians. Encouraged by the presence of this garrison, as well as by the approach of the victorious Austrians from the Tyrol, and the entry of several thousand armed peasants into the town, the inhabitants rose against the French, massacred some of them in the streets, and attacked the garrison in the castle. The arrival of French reinforcements at length compelled the insurgents to surrender at discretion, not, however, before they had killed more than 100 of the French, with a loss on their side of about a quarter of that number. But the most horrible feature in this riot was the murder of more than 400 sick French soldiers in the hospitals; an act of cruelty which procured for it the name of the *Vêpres Véronèses*.

Whether the Venetian Government was implicated in this affair or not, Bonaparte, whose hands were now freed by the peace with Austria, took care not to let slip so excellent an opportunity for quarrelling with them. He received the Venetian commissaries sent to deprecate his wrath with that blustering fury which always harbingered a storm. He told them that they must decide between England and France, repeatedly exclaimed that he had 80,000 men. "I will have no Inquisition," he continued, "no Senate; I shall be an Attila for Venice!" Arrived at Palmanuova, he published a regular declaration of war, May 2nd, though he had no authority from his Government for such a step. Among the chief grievances alleged in this manifest against the Venetian Government, were the arming of 40,000 Slavonians in order to cut off the French communications, the insults and assassinations committed upon the French in various parts of the Venetian dominions, and especially at Verona; and the death of Laugier, commander of a French privateer, who had been killed at the Lido, while endeavouring to force a passage contrary to the regulations of the port. The manifest concluded by ordering the French minister to quit Venice, the agents of the Venetian Re-

public in Lombardy and the Terra Firma to depart within twenty-four hours, the French generals of division to treat the Venetian troops as enemies, and to overthrow the Lion of St. Mark. A body of 20,000 French troops was then assembled on the borders of the Lagoons.

Among the Venetians themselves was a strong party in favour of the French and their political institutions. At the head of it were the Senators Battaglia, Dona, and San Fermo; Admiral Condulmer, commandant of the Lagoons, also belonged to it; nay, the Doge Manini himself, naturally weak, and whom age had rendered still more imbecile, implicitly obeyed its counsels. It had been directed by Lallemand, the French ambassador to the Republic; and when that minister, agreeably to the declaration of war, quitted Venice, his office as leader of the French party, was supplied by Villetard, the Secretary of Legation, who remained behind, and even retained over his door the arms of the French Republic. Thus Venice was threatened both from without and from within.

After a short visit to Milan, which he entered with all the pomp of sovereignty, Bonaparte returned to Mestre, the headquarters of the French upon the Lagoons. Before he arrived there he had granted the Venetians an armistice of twelve days to consider the terms which he offered. No harder ones could have been imposed if the city had been conquered. He demanded the suppression of the Senate and Council of Ten; the arrest and trial of the three State Inquisitors, of the Proveditore of Venice, and the Commandant of the Lido or Port; the liberation of all political prisoners; and a total disarmament. Yet, among the Senators, only two, Pesaro and Justiniani, were for resistance; although, with a little resolution, Venice might easily have been defended. The sinuous Lagoons were difficult to pass; the French had no flotilla, while the Venetians possessed between 200 and 300 vessels manned by 8000 sailors; there were 10,000 Slavonian soldiers in the city, and several English frigates were cruising in the Adriatic, which would have come to the aid of Venice at the first signal. But her fall had already been prepared by her own Government. The Doge had assembled on April 30th an extraordinary and illegal committee of forty-three senators, in which it had been determined that, agreeably to the wishes of the French party, the Government should be rendered more democratic. The demands of Bonaparte were accepted, and three plenipotentiaries were despatched to treat with him for a peace at Milan, whither he had now returned.

Bonaparte has himself explained, in his confidential letters to

the Directory, his motives for entering into this treaty. By means of it the French would be enabled to enter Venice without opposition, to obtain possession of the arsenal and other public establishments, which were to be despoiled of their contents, *under the pretext of executing the secret articles.* If the peace with the Emperor should not be ratified, the possession of Venice would enable the French to turn its resources against him. Finally, the treaty would appease any clamour in Europe, since it would state that the occupation was a mere momentary act, solicited by the Venetians themselves. Bonaparte added that he intended to seize all their vessels, carry off their cannon, destroy the bank, and keep Corfù as well as Ancona.[47] It was with such intentions that the Treaty of Milan was signed, May 16th, by Bonaparte and Lallemand on one side, and by Dona, Justiniani, and Mocenigo on the other. It consisted of six patent and six secret articles. The principal conditions of the patent articles were, that the Grand Council renounced its rights of sovereignty, directed the abdication of the hereditary aristocracy, and recognised the sovereignty of the State in the assembly of the citizens. The new Government, however, was to guarantee the public debt, as well as the maintenance of poor gentlemen and the life-pensions hitherto granted under the title of "*provisions.*" A body of French troops was to be kept in the city till the Government should signify that it had no longer need of them; and all the Venetian territory was to be evacuated by the French at the Continental Peace. The trials of the Inquisitors and of the Commandant of the fort of Lido, accused of being the authors and instigators of the assassinations committed on the French, were to be brought to a speedy termination. By the secret articles, the two Republics were to come to an understanding about the exchange of different territories; Venice was to pay three million livres in the space of three months, and three millions more in hemp, cordage, and other marine stores; she was to furnish three ships of the line and three frigates, fully armed and equipped, and to deliver 20 pictures and 500 manuscripts.[48]

But while the negociations for this treaty were proceeding at Milan, a complete revolution took place at Venice. In conformity with Bonaparte's requisitions the ships had been ordered to be disarmed, the Slavonian troops to be dismissed, and on May 11th the Doge Manini invited the Senators to depose their powers into the hands of a commission of ten persons, to be named with the approbation of Bonaparte. But on the following day, through the

[47] *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. iii. p. 55.
[48] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 391; Haller, *Geh. Gesch.*, B. v. S. 15.

influence of the French party, a new democratic municipal Council was elected, consisting of sixty persons of all ranks and nations. Riots ensued, which lasted three or four days, in which the Slavonians played the principal part, and which had for their object plunder rather than a counter-revolution. They served, however, as a pretext for introducing the troops of Baraguay d'Hilliers into the city, 3000 or 4000 of whom were conveyed over the Lagoon on the night of May 15th, in barks provided for them by the French party. The Slavonians, with their commander Morosini, had previously set sail for Zara, after plundering the villages of Lido and Malamocco.

Thus, on the conclusion of the Treaty of Milan a new revolutionary Government had been established at Venice. The new Council ratified the treaty; but as the French troops had obtained entrance into Venice without the aid of its stipulations, Bonaparte refused to ratify, availing himself of the miserable subterfuge that he had not negociated with the new Government. He now demanded five millions instead of three, and directed the Venetians to seize 100,000 ducats belonging to their guest the Duke of Modena. The French, by their subsequent barbarous proceedings, realised Bonaparte's threat that he would prove an Attila for Venice. Before quitting it, they seized the whole Venetian fleet and all the cannon and stores that were serviceable; they demolished the Bucentaur, burnt the Golden Book at the foot of a tree of liberty, and carried off the bronze horses, the spoils of Constantinople, which had so long been the pride and ornament of Venice; thus depriving her even of the monuments and trophies of her ancient glory. By the aid of a Venetian flotilla the French also took possession of the Ionian Islands.

Such was the end of the renowned Republic of Venice, the most ancient Government in Europe. More astonishment, however, was created by the Austrians taking possession of Venetian Istria and Dalmatia than by all the proceedings of the French. This step was preceded and coloured by a hypocritical manifesto respecting the necessity of enforcing order in those states; but it was in reality a result of the secret articles of Léoben.[49]

The revolution in Venice was soon followed by another in Genoa, also organised by the plots of the French minister there, Faypoult. The Genoese had in general shown themselves favourable to France;

[49] See in general for the above account of the fall of Venice, *Daru, Hist. de Vénise*, liv. xxxvii.; Tiepolo, *Discorsi sulla Storia del sign. Daru*; Tentori, *Documenti della caduta di Venezia*; Botta, *Storia d'Italia dal* 1789 *al* 1814, lib. x.; *Mém. d'un Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 306 sqq.

but there existed among the nobles an anti-French party; the Senate, like that of Venice, was too aristocratic to suit Bonaparte's or the Directory's notions; and it was considered that Genoa, under a democratic constitution, would be more subservient to French interests. An insurrection, prepared by Faypoult, of some 700 or 800 of the lowest class of Genoese, aided by Frenchmen and Lombards, broke out on May 22nd, but was put down by the great mass of the real Genoese people. Bonaparte, however, was determined to effect his object. He directed a force of 12,000 men on Genoa, and despatched Lavalette with a letter to the Doge (May 27th), very similar to that which Junot had carried to Manini, requiring him to liberate all the French who had been imprisoned, to arrest those who had excited the people against France, and to disarm the citizens. These orders were to be executed within twenty-four hours, otherwise the French minister would leave Genoa, and the aristocracy would cease to exist.[50] Faypoult further demanded the arrest of three of the principal nobles, and the establishment of a more democratic constitution. Bonaparte's threats were attended by the same magical effects at Genoa as had followed them at Venice. The Senate immediately despatched three nobles to treat with him, and on June 6th was concluded the Treaty of Montebello.[51] The Government of Genoa recognised by this treaty the sovereignty of the people, confided the legislative power to two Councils, one of 300, the other of 500 members, the executive power to a Senate of twelve, presided over by the Doge. Meanwhile a provisional government was to be established. By a secret article a contribution of four millions, disguised under the name of a loan, was imposed upon Genoa. Her obedience was recompensed with a considerable augmentation of territory, and the incorporation of the districts known as the "imperial fiefs." Such was the origin of the Ligurian Republic.

Austrian Lombardy, after its conquest, had also been formed into the "Lombard Republic;" but the Directory had not recognised it, awaiting a final settlement of Italy through a peace with Austria. Bonaparte, after taking possession of the Duchy of Modena and the Legations, had, at first, thought of erecting them into an independent state under the name of the "Cispadane Republic;" but he afterwards changed his mind and united these states with Lombardy under the title of the Cisalpine Republic. He declared, in the name of the Directory, the independence of this new republic, June 29th 1797; reserving, however, the right of nominating, for

[50] *Corr. de Napoléon I.*, t. iii. p. 75.

[51] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 394.

the first time, the members of the Government and of the legislative body. The districts of the Valteline, Chiavenna, and Bormio, subject to the Grison League, in which discontent and disturbance had been excited by French agents, were united in October to the new state; whose constitution was modelled on that of the French Republic.

Bonaparte was commissioned by the Directory to negociate a definitive peace with Austria, and conferences were opened for that purpose at Montebello, Bonaparte's residence near Milan. The negociations were chiefly managed by himself, and on the part of Austria by the Marquis di Gallo, the Neapolitan ambassador at Vienna, and Count Meerfeld. There was at this time a very strong connection between Austria and Naples. The Emperor Francis II. was governed by his second wife, a daughter of the Neapolitan Queen Caroline, who, in turn, acted only by the advice of the Marquis. The negociations were protracted six months, partly through Bonaparte's engagements in arranging the affairs of the new Italian republics, but more especially by divisions and feuds in the French Directory, ending in a revolution which we must now describe.

The Directory and the two Councils had hitherto acted together with tolerable harmony; but great discontent prevailed among the public. A strong reactionary, and even royalist, party had grown up, and the elections of May 1797 entirely changed the aspect of affairs. A third part of the members of the Councils having then resigned, agreeably to the new constitution, their places were supplied by anti-Jacobins, and even by known royalists; among whom were generals Pichegru, Barbé Marbois, Dumas, Dupont de Nemours, General Willot, and others. The reactionary party now formed a majority in the two Councils, and were thus opposed to the executive Directory; in which also a change had taken place. Letourneur de la Manche had gone out by lot, and the new chambers elected Barthélemy to succeed him. Barthélemy, formerly French ambassador in Switzerland, a man of moderate principles, acted with and adopted the views of Carnot; and though these two Directors were far from being royalists, they were still further from agreeing with the violent counsels of their three colleagues, Barras, Rewbel, and La Réveillère-Lépeaux. Thus the majority of the Directory were opposed by the majority of the Councils, a state of things which could not but end in a collision. But though the three Directors who acted together, and who obtained the name of the *triumvirs*, were opposed by the legislature, they were supported by the army; a circumstance which naturally led to an appeal to

force, and originated that military despotism which far-seeing politicians had foretold as the inevitable end of the French Revolution.

As soon as the two new Councils had been constituted, 1st *Prairial*, an V (May 20th 1767), Pichegru was elected president of the Five Hundred, and Barbé Marbois of the Ancients. The administration of the Directory was now violently assailed, particularly their war policy and their financial measures, and peace, economy, an unrestricted liberty of the press were loudly advocated. Camille Jordan, a young deputy from Lyon, enthusiastically pleaded the cause of the clergy. The restoration of Catholic worship, the repeal of the decree of banishment against non-juring priests, as well as that against emigrants, were demanded, and numbers of both those proscribed orders returned into France. In the provinces counter-revolutionary reprisals were exercised against the patriots and the occupants of the national property. The royalist party established the Club of Clichy, while the triumvirs, who found the power of the Directory almost paralysed, endeavoured to reorganise Jacobinism.

In this state of things the reactionary party began to contemplate the restoration of royalty; while the triumvirs, on their side, determined to put down their opponents by a *coup d'état*, supported by military force. Resort to such a step was indeed their only alternative, as they had no power under the constitution to appeal to the people by dissolving the councils. Hoche, who now commanded the army of the Sambre and Meuse, a man of violent and extreme principles, was entirely devoted to Barras and his colleagues; and as his army was the nearest to Paris, he was directed to march several regiments on that capital. In spite of the remonstrances of the Councils, these troops, on futile pretences, overstepped the constitutional radius of twelve leagues from the metropolis, and were quartered in the neighbourhood of Paris. The views of General Bonaparte were at first dubious. He was too prudent to commit himself at once to the majority of the Directory like Hoche. Besides, he shared the more moderate views of Carnot and the peace party with regard to the affairs of Italy and the pacification with Austria. In other respects, however, he was by no means inclined to support the reaction. He had been violently abused in the Club of Clichy. His application of the public money for military purposes had been severely censured in the Council of Five Hundred, who had passed a resolution depriving the generals of all control over the finances; but this had been rejected by the Ancients. Bonaparte, moreover, had always been

the opponent of Pichegru, and he was the mortal enemy of Willot, a royalist general in Southern France, whom Carnot had patronised by way of counterpoise to him. No doubt Bonaparte was also sensible that the restoration of royalty would prove a death-blow to his power, and put an end to all his schemes of ambition; and under the influence of these feelings he despatched his aide-de-camp, Lavalette, to Paris, to offer his services to the triumvirs, but, at the same time, with instructions not to compromise him with Carnot. The triumvirate, in a secret letter, accepted his promise to march on Paris, in case of need, with 25,000 men, as well as his offer of three millions to aid the *coup d'état*. Thus the conqueror of Italy, the vanquisher of Austria, was to become the arbiter of the government under which he held his command.

Bonaparte urged on the triumvirate the necessity for speedy action. The summer was waning fast; if the negociations for a peace with Austria should not be brought to a satisfactory conclusion before the autumn, it would be too late to chastise that Power by renewing the campaign. The Cabinet of Vienna, aware of the state of parties in France, was anxiously awaiting the result, and sought every pretext to procrastinate the negociations. Bonaparte himself, instead of going to Udine, took up his residence at Milan, where he was nearer to the scene of action. On August 10th, the anniversary of the fall of royalty, he caused his soldiers to swear on the *autel de la patrie* to exterminate all conspirators and traitors. Threatening addresses of the most violent kind from the divisions of Joubert, Augereau, and Masséna were got up and sent to Paris. Bernadotte, who saw through Bonaparte, hesitated to follow this example; and the address of his division, when at length made, was in a much milder form than the others. Augereau, a rough and somewhat braggart soldier, without any political capacity, and of whose rivalship Bonaparte had therefore no dread, was despatched to Paris with the addresses and to assist the *coup de main*. He was appointed commandant of the 17th military division, which included the metropolis; and the military posts were also intrusted to officers of the army of Italy.

While the triumvirs were contemplating their *coup de main*, the legislature was also preparing a revolution. On the motion of Pichegru, 17th *Fructidor* (September 3rd), a national guard was ordered to be immediately formed, after which the troops of the line were to be directed to retire from the neighbourhood of Paris. General Willot was for more violent measures: an insurrection of the Sections, and the accusation of Barras, Rewbel, and La Réveillère. But, as it happens in such cases, the counsels of so large

a number were paralysed by hesitation and difference of opinion; their designs were betrayed to the triumvirs, who acted with energy and decision. During the night of September 3rd, the troops cantoned round Paris entered that city, and, under the command of Augereau, were planted round the Tuileries, to the number of 12,000 men with 40 guns. At four in the morning of September 4th (18th *Fructidor*), the alarm gun was fired; Augereau presented himself at the *grille* of the Pont Tournant, where Ramel, who commanded the guard assigned to the legislature, had stationed 800 grenadiers, a force quite inadequate for effective resistance, even had they been inclined to resist. To Augereau's question, "Are you Republicans?" the grenadiers responded with shouts of *Vive Augereau*! *Vive le Directoire*! and immediately joined his troops. Augereau now caused Pichegru, Willot, Ramel, and other leaders of the reactionary party to be arrested; the Council of Five Hundred was directed to assemble in the *Odéon* theatre, that of the Ancients in the *École de Médecine*, with the view of compelling them to give a legal sanction to the proceedings of the three Directors. These assemblies having declared themselves *en permanence*, a message was sent to acquaint them with what had been done and the motive for it, the discovery of a conspiracy for the restoration of royalty. The Council of Five Hundred named a commission composed of Sieyès and four other members to take measures for the public safety. The law which they presented was in fact an ostracism; nothing more arbitrary or violent had been perpetrated under the Reign of Terror, except that transportation was substituted for the *guillotine*. Carnot, Barthélemy, and upwards of fifty members of the Council were proscribed, including Pichegru, Boissy d'Anglas, Camille Jordan, Willot, and Barbé Marbois. Proofs of a royalist conspiracy[52] were got up from some papers seized on the Count d'Entraigues at Venice, and forwarded by Bonaparte to the Directory; as well as from Pichegru's correspondence with the Prince of Condé, which Moreau had seized some months before in a carriage belonging to the Austrian general Klinglin. Pichegru's intrigues had long been well known to the Directory; Moreau himself was implicated in them, and betrayed his friend and patron at the last hour. Moreau was deprived of his command;[53] Barthélemy, Pichegru, and about twenty other

[52] However defective might be the evidence adduced, there can be no doubt that schemes were in agitation for restoring the ancient *régime*. Madame de Staël, who was in Paris at this time, and was very instrumental in bringing Talleyrand into the ministry, observes: "Il y avait dans l'intérieur des deux conseils un parti très décidé à ramener l'ancien régime, et le général Pichegru en était un des principaux instruments." *De la Révol.*, part iii. ch. 24.

[53] Montgaillard, t. v. p. 32, 49 sqq.

persons, were sentenced to be transported to the unhealthy swamps of Guiana. Their punishment was carried out with barbarous inhumanity. They were conveyed to the port of embarkation, like wild beasts, in iron cages, and suffered during the passage miseries that can only be compared to those endured by negroes in a slave-trader. A great many of the proscribed persons, however, never left the Isle of Ré. Carnot concealed himself in the house of a friend and succeeded in escaping into Germany. The proscription was subsequently extended, and the editors of thirty-five journals were condemned to transportation. Regulations were adopted calculated to strengthen the hands of the victorious faction. The elections were annulled in forty-eight of the eighty-three departments; the laws recently passed in favour of priests and emigrants were repealed; emigrants not struck out of the list were ordered to quit Paris in twenty-four hours on pain of being brought before a court-martial; an oath of fidelity to the Republic and to the constitution of the year III, as well as of hatred to monarchy and anarchy, was exacted from all public officers; all members of the Bourbon family were directed to leave France, even those who had remained in it during the Reign of Terror; the whole administration of the department of the Seine was altered; newspapers were placed under the surveillance of the police during a year. Thus the oligarchy of the three Directors, Rewbel, Barras, and La Réveillère-Lepeaux, and of their ministers, Merlin, Schérer, and Talleyrand, was established solely by the sword of Augereau; the populace took no part whatever in the matter. The republican party was revived, that of the royalists defeated and humbled, and prepared for submission under the Consulate and Empire. The two Councils, as altered by the new elections, became little more than the registrars of the Directory, whose number was completed by the addition of Merlin de Douai and François de Neufchâteau.

The revolution of 18th *Fructidor* had great influence on the negociations with Austria, to which we must now revert. Bonaparte, satisfied that the success of the *coup d'état* was insured by the military arrangements, proceeded to the château of Passeriano, near Udine, before the end of August. Bonaparte, to whom the Directory now intrusted the whole conduct of the negociations, showed himself as able a diplomatist as he had proved a matchless commander. Military skill alone would, indeed, never have achieved his wonderful fortunes. The qualities which he displayed in these negociations, his broad and statesmanlike views, his clear and penetrating judgment of men and events,

contributed as much to pave his way to future empire as the brilliant victories won by his sword. But although the Directory seemed to have accorded their entire confidence to Bonaparte, to whom they were so greatly indebted for their power, yet they were far from agreeing with him as to the objects of the future peace. Barras, the violent Rewbel, and their colleagues, retained their former extravagant and warlike views. They were for rejecting altogether the preliminaries of Léoben as the basis of negociation; they insisted upon retaining Mantua, which, by the secret articles of those preliminaries, had been conceded to the Emperor; they wished to make the Tagliamento, instead of the Adige, the limit of the Austrian territories in Italy; thus giving the city and port of Venice to the Cisalpine Republic; and to revolutionise Piedmont, Rome, and Naples. With this last view they refused to ratify the offensive and defensive alliance which Bonaparte had concluded in April with the King of Sardinia, and which he regarded as essential to the safety and success of his military operations in Italy. In spite of their obligations to him, they looked with suspicion on the young Corsican who thus undertook to protect kings and princes, to overthrow republics, and distribute their spoils, who aspired to be sole arbiter of peace and war. They also regarded the continuance of the war as the best security for their hold of power, and the only means of maintaining and paying their armies; and in these views they were supported by the ultra-revolutionary party. By way of counterpoise to Bonaparte, they appointed the violent and unreflecting Augereau to the command of the armies of the Rhine and Moselle and of the Sambre and Meuse, now united into one. The command of the former had been vacated by the removal of Moreau, that of the latter by the unexpected death of Hoche. Augereau, at the head of such a force, and supported by the Government, had he had any political genius, might have become the master of the Revolution, have forestalled the part of Bonaparte. Instead of that, he rendered himself the mere tool of the Directory. On assuming the command, he published an inflammatory address, well calculated to provoke a renewal of hostilities, a step which formed one of Bonaparte's motives for accelerating a peace.

Bonaparte's prudence and moderation at this juncture form a striking contrast to the violent counsels of the Directory. He perceived that more would be gained by peace than by war. The abandonment which he advised of Venice to Austria, thus depriving the Cisalpine Republic of a seaport, and putting into the Emperor's hands the key of Italy, was indeed a point on which

great difference of opinion might be fairly entertained. The making over of that ancient commonwealth to an absolute master could not but excite the bitterest dissatisfaction in the minds both of the Venetian and the Lombard patriots. Battaglia and Dandolo, the chiefs of the democratic party at Venice, offered Bonaparte 18,000,000 francs, and an auxiliary corps of 18,000 men, to induce him to unite Venice with the Cisalpine Republic, and continue the war with Austria.[54] But Bonaparte could not be shaken from his resolution. He had calculated the chances of a winter campaign, and he knew that the Austrians had collected an army of 120,000 men on the frontiers of Italy for the purpose of securing Venice. The doctrine that France was to fight for the liberty of other nations he, as usual, threw to the winds.[55] His views at this time are admirably explained in a despatch to Talleyrand of October 7th.[56] He warns against a rash precipitancy, alludes to the characteristic of the French to be too elated in prosperity; "yet," he continues, "if such be *the order of destiny*, I think it not impossible that in a few years we may arrive at those grand results of which the heated imagination catches a glimpse, but which only the cool, the persevering, and the judicious ever attain." So calmly could the young soldier reason who had thrown himself *à corps perdu* into the defiles of the Noric Alps! Yet in the midst of this moderation starts forth the sudden apparition of the man of destiny; the pregnant future looms hazily on his mental vision, but, with a singular mixture of fatalism and reason, he proclaims that it can be realised only by the ordinary means that insure all human success. This uncommon union of prudence with an audacity often amounting to rashness is one of the most striking and singular features in Bonaparte's character, and affords the key to his wonderful career. He seemed to know instinctively how far he might carry his pretensions and when it was time to retire. Thus, though he abandoned Venice, he settled the question about Mantua without any negociation, by proclaiming its union with the Cisalpine Republic, September 27th.[57]

On the renewal of the negociations at Udine the Cabinet of Vienna despatched thither Count Louis Cobentzl, its ablest and most practised diplomatist. The Count brought a letter from Francis II. to General Bonaparte, conceived in very flattering terms, in which he expressed his anxious desire for peace. "After

[54] *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 16.

[55] "Jamais la république Française n'a adopté pour maxime de faire la guerre pour les autres peuples," &c. &c. See *Lettre confidentielle à Villetard, Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. iii. p. 399.

[56] *Ibid.* p. 269.

[57] Garden, t. v. p. 414.

this renewed assurance of the spirit of conciliation with which I am animated," observed the Emperor, "I doubt not you will feel that peace is in your hands, and that on your determinations depends the happiness or misery of many thousands of men." This was literally true. Bonaparte, as we have said, was as desirous of peace as the Emperor; though probably Francis's argument drawn from the miseries occasioned by war, had not the same weight with him at this juncture as when he addressed his letter to the Archduke Charles in the gorges of Carinthia. He had been secretly tempted, it is said, by another motive. The Emperor at this time offered, through Cobentzl, to erect for him in Germany a principality of at least 250,000 souls, so that he might be for ever sheltered from political vicissitudes and the notorious ingratitude of republican governments. But Bonaparte declined to accept anything except at the hands of the French nation.[58] His way of negociating was as effective against the traditional dilatoriness of Austrian diplomacy as his new method of warfare had been against their antiquated tactics in the field. His very first interview with Count Cobentzl brought the practised diplomatist to his level.[59] The catastrophe of the negociations, so to speak, was brought about by one of those acts of brutality and vulgar insolence which he scrupled not to do in order to gain his ends. In a last interview, October 14th, Cobentzl, resorting to his usual delays, Bonaparte suddenly sprang up in well-acted fury, and exclaiming with an oath: "You want war? well, you shall have it!" he seized a magnificent porcelain tea-table, a present, as Cobentzl daily boasted, from Catherine the Great, and dashing it with all his might upon the floor, shivered it into a thousand fragments. Then, crying with a voice of thunder: "See! such I promise you shall be your Austrian monarchy before three months are over!" he rushed out of the room. Cobentzl was petrified with astonishment, while M. de Gallo followed the enraged plenipotentiary to his carriage, endeavoured to retain him, made so many bows and assumed altogether so piteous a demeanour, that Bonaparte, in spite of his simulated fury, could scarcely refrain from laughter.[60]

Three days after this scene, not unworthy of Gil Blas, was concluded the Peace of Campo Formio (October 17th). It derived

[58] *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 67.

[59] Bonaparte himself says: "Fier de son rang et de son importance, il (Cobentzl) ne doutait pas que la dignité de ses manières et son habitude des cours ne dussent écraser facilement un général sorti des camps révolutionnaires: aussi aborda-t-il le général Français avec une certaine légèreté; mais il suffit de l'attitude et des premières paroles de celui-çi pour le remettre aussitôt à sa place, dont, au demeurant, il ne chercha jamais plus à sortir." Ap. *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 562.

[60] *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 589.

this name from its having been signed in a ruined castle situated in a small village of that name near Udine; a place selected on grounds of etiquette in preference to the residence of either of the negociators. By this treaty[61] the Emperor ceded the Austrian Netherlands to France; abandoned to the Cisalpine Republic, which he recognised, Bergamo, Brescia, Crema, Peschiera, the town and fortress of Mantua with their territories, and all that part of the former Venetian possessions to the south and west of a line which, commencing in the Tyrol, traversed the Lago di Garda, the left bank of the Adige, but including Porto Legnago on the right bank, and thence along the left bank of the Po, to its mouth. France was to possess the Ionian Islands, and all the Venetian settlements in Albania below the Gulf of Lodrino; the French Republic agreeing on its side that the Emperor should have Istria, Dalmatia, the Venetian isles in the Adriatic, the mouths of the Cattaro, the city of Venice, the Lagoons, and all the former Venetian terra firma to the line before described. The Emperor ceded the Breisgau to the Duke of Modena, to be held on the same conditions as he had held the Modenese. A congress composed of the plenipotentiaries of the German Federation was to assemble immediately, to treat of a peace between France and the Empire.

To this patent treaty was added another secret one,[62] by the principal article of which the Emperor consented that France should have the frontier of the Rhine, except the Prussian possessions, and stipulated that the Imperial troops should enter Venice on the same day that the French entered Mentz. He also promised to use his influence to obtain the accession of the Empire to this arrangement; and if that body withheld its consent, to give it no more assistance than his contingent. The navigation of the Rhine to be declared free. If, at the peace with the Empire, the French Republic should make any acquisitions in Germany, the Emperor was to obtain an equivalent there, and *vice versâ*. The Dutch Stadtholder to have a territorial indemnity. To the King of Prussia were to be restored his possessions on the left bank of the Rhine, and he was consequently to have no new acquisitions in Germany. Princes and States of the Empire, damnified by this treaty, to obtain a suitable indemnity. In what this was to consist is not specified; but the omission of the Bishops of Basle, Strassburg, and Spire from the list of those who were to receive such compensation, shows that it was not designed to re-establish those bishoprics, and that consequently the Emperor had consented

[61] Martens, t. vi. p. 420.

[62] Garden, t. v. p. 420.

to the secularisation of their possessions. The Emperor also virtually acknowledged his recognition of the principle of secularisation by the fifth article of the Secret Treaty, by which he accepted the good offices of the French Republic to procure for him the archbishopric of Saltzburg. The open and unconditional acceptance of this principle by Frederick William II. in July at Pyrmont, at the instance of Talleyrand, the French foreign minister, had helped to remove the Emperor's scruples, and thus to facilitate the Peace of Campo Formio, though, as a Catholic monarch and head of the Empire, he had less justification for such an act than the Prussian King. Yet Austria and France agreed to shut out Prussia from participating in the secularisations.[63] On the other hand, the Court of Vienna preserved the three ecclesiastical electorates of Mentz, Trèves, and Cologne.

By the Treaty of Campo Formio was terminated not only the Italian campaign, but also the first continental war of the Revolution. The establishment of Bonaparte's prestige and power by the former was a result still more momentous in its consequences for Europe than the fall of Venice and the revolutionising of Northern Italy. The war with Austria and the first Coalition, declared by Louis XVI. in 1792, was concluded by the men who had sent the royal martyr to the scaffold. A struggle of five years' duration respecting the territorial rights of some princes of the Empire on the left bank of the Rhine, had ended with the total alienation of their possessions in that quarter. The Austrian Netherlands had been acquired by France, and were incorporated with that country under the name of the Circle of Burgundy. The United Provinces, which, under the Stadtholderate, had been so closely allied with England, had, under the name of the Batavian Republic, been converted into a state entirely dependent upon France. Towards the Alps and Italy the French Republic had acquired Avignon, Savoy, and Nice; the King of Sardinia, under the title of an ally, had become little more than the vassal of the Directory; in Lombardy and Northern Italy, had been formed from the spoils of Austria, the Pope, the House of Este, and the Republic of Venice, another of those satellitious commonwealths with which the Directory had determined to surround itself. No less striking and extraordinary than these events was the renewal of the Family Compact by a Spanish King of the House of Bourbon with the murderers of Louis XVI., the head of the elder branch of his family.

[63] Menzel, B. vi. S. 376 f.

Thus the Revolution, which the German sovereigns had thought to put down by a military promenade, had proved itself stronger than Europe. The ancient political system of the Continent had been shaken to its foundations. Austria, the most conservative of European states, had joined in the revolutionary Treaty of Campo Formio, based on a partition of the spoils of a neutral and inoffensive Power, and containing in its secret articles the germs of future revolutions and interminable wars. But if the French Revolution had mastered Europe, it had itself found a master in Bonaparte, who was to become for many years almost the sole arbiter both of France and the Continent.

The two years of Bonaparte's wars in Italy are estimated to have cost that peninsula 400,000,000 francs, or 16,000,000*l.* sterling, in contributions, requisitions, exactions, and pillage. It is pretended that the French general on his return had no more than 300,000 francs, and this assertion has been repeated in the works dictated at St. Helena; but it is now averred that he certainly possessed at that period more than three millions in specie. This was the sum which he had promised to forward to the Directors for the revolution of 18th *Fructidor*; but he afterwards reconsidered the matter and kept the money for himself, not from avidity, but to further his schemes for the future.[64]

[64] *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 11.

CHAPTER IX.

Frederick William II. did not live to hear the particulars of the Peace of Campo Formio, and the way in which he had been treated by his French allies. He had long been in a declining state of health, the consequence of sensual excesses of all kinds, and on November 16th 1797 he expired at Potsdam, in the fifty-fourth year of his age and twelfth of his reign. He was succeeded by his son, Frederick William III., born August 3rd 1770. This young Prince, endowed with only moderate abilities, was remarkable for his moral and domestic habits. One of his first steps was to cause the Countess of Lichtenau, his late father's mistress, to be arrested. She was stripped of her ill-gotten wealth and imprisoned for some time in the fortress of Glogau. Frederick William II.'s favourite general, Bischofswerder, was dismissed into poverty and obscurity, with a pension of 1200 thalers (180*l.*). Lucchesini avoided the disgrace of a dismissal by retiring before his royal master's death. But the late King's principal ministers, Haugwitz, Lombard, and Lecoq, were retained, and thus no change ensued in the Prussian policy. On the very first day of his reign Frederick William III. addressed a letter to the Directors of the French Republic, whom he called "his great and dear friends," and promised to cultivate the harmony which had hitherto subsisted between the two nations. But it soon became evident that, since the Treaty of Campo Formio, the Cabinet of the Luxembourg had adopted the policy of embroiling Austria and Prussia, by treating the former with great consideration and manifesting a complete indifference for the latter.[1]

England, after the preliminaries of Léoben, seeing herself deserted by Austria, had also endeavoured to arrange a peace with France; and with that view Lord Malmesbury had been despatched to Lille in June, to confer with the ex-Director, Letourneur de la Manche, and two other French plenipotentiaries. But it soon became evident that little hope could be entertained of a favourable issue to the negociations. Although the English

[1] *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 43.

Cabinet offered to restore all the possessions they had conquered from France, and even those which they had wrested from Holland and Spain, with the exception only of the Cape of Good Hope [2] and the Island of Trinidad (conquered from the Spaniards, February 18th 1797), the French ministers refused to negociate unless, as a preliminary, she consented to restore all her conquests whatsoever; thus, at the very outset, as Lord Malmesbury observed, leaving no grounds for treating at all.[3] The negociations were now purposely protracted by the Directory. The minority of that body, indeed, and the majority of the two Legislative Councils, seem to have been sincerely desirous of peace; but the triumvirs Rewbel, Barras, and La Réveillère-Lepeaux, had resolved on war. Immediately after the revolution of 18th *Fructidor*, the French plenipotentiaries at Lille were replaced by Treilhard and Bonnier, two violent members of the late Convention. On September 16th, Treilhard demanded of Lord Malmesbury whether he had powers to restore all their colonies to France and her allies? and receiving an answer in the negative, brutally exclaimed: "Well, then, go and fetch them!" Passports were now sent to the English minister, who was directed to quit France in twenty-four hours.[4] Yet the French plenipotentiaries remained at Lille till October 16th, pretending to expect Lord Malmesbury's return!

Great Britain was thus left to contend alone with the now colossal power of France. Even Portugal, her ancient ally, had been constrained to abandon her. At the time of the Treaty of Basle, Spain had engaged to use her influence to detach Portugal from the English alliance; and when the Court of Madrid declared war against England, the Portuguese Queen, Maria I., was required to make common cause with Spain and France, and threatened with war in case of refusal. A Spanish army was actually assembled on the frontiers of Portugal. The Court of Lisbon made extraordinary preparations for defence, which were supported by the British Government. Prince John, the Regent, was, however, anxious for a peace with the French Republic; and the Portuguese minister, Don Antonio Aranjo de Azevedo, taking advantage of the Directory's want of money for their *coup d'état* of 18th *Fructidor*, purchased from them, at the price of six million francs, a tolerably advantageous treaty, August 20th

[2] The Dutch possessions, conquered in the East Indies, were to be exchanged for Negapatnam.

[3] Adolphus, *George III.*, vol. vi. p. 635 sq.

[4] *Homme d'état*, t. iv. p. 537 sq.

1797,[5] which the French Legislature ratified September 12th. In consequence of this transaction, Admiral Jervis, now Lord St. Vincent, entered the Tagus; troops were landed, who occupied fort St. Julian commanding the port; and the English Cabinet declared that the ratification of the treaty with France would be regarded as an act of hostility. The Regent, under these circumstances, declined to ratify; the Directory declared the treaty null and void, October 26th, and the Portuguese minister was ordered to leave Paris. When, however, the Peace of Campo Formio had released the French armies, and the representations of the Spanish Court became still more pressing, the Regent, dreading the dangers to which he was exposed on this side, even more than a rupture with England, reconciled himself with the Directory and ratified the treaty, December 1st.

The French, having effected their purpose of isolating England, resolved to strike a blow at her very heart. They saw that on the ocean, on which alone the war would henceforth be prosecuted, she was able to bid defiance to the combined efforts of Europe. In the course of the year, by Admiral Jervis's victory over the Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent, February 14th, and by that of Admiral Duncan over the Dutch fleet under Winter at Camperdown, October 11th, she had severely crippled the naval power of those allies of France. An invasion, and if possible, a conquest of England, seemed the only method of destroying her maritime superiority. A futile attempt, made early in the year, to ascend the Avon and burn Bristol, which ended in the capture of all concerned in it, we shall not here relate. Bonaparte, immediately after the Peace of Campo Formio, formed a plan for invading England on a grand scale, though it may be doubted whether he really intended to execute it. In a letter to the foreign minister, Talleyrand, October 18th,[6] he observes: "The Austrians are heavy and avaricious; there is no people less intriguing, or less dangerous for our military affairs. The English, on the contrary, are generous, intriguing, and enterprising. Our Government must destroy the English monarchy, or must expect itself to be destroyed by the corruption and intrigues of these active islanders. The present moment offers a good opportunity. Let us concentrate all our activity on the navy and destroy England. That effected, all Europe is at our feet." The Directory hastened to accept a scheme, which, however ideal, would disembarrass them of a commander whom they suspected. Taking Bonaparte at his

[5] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vi. p. 413 sqq. [6] *Corr. de Napoléon I.*, t. iii. p. 392.

word, they named, on the very day that his despatch was received, Berthier to the command of the army of Italy, ordered several corps to assemble on the coasts of the Channel, appointed Bonaparte to the command of the "army of England," which till his arrival was given provisionally to Desaix. Bonaparte, on reviewing the French troops at Milan, November 4th, announced to them this appointment, told them that they must not lay down their arms till England had been conquered. From the army of Italy 36,000 men were directed towards the ocean. So great was the presumption, or rather perhaps the simulated confidence, of the Directory, that they opened a loan which was to be repaid out of the spoils of England. A more tangible security was the seizure and sale of all English goods held by French merchants; an act of injustice towards French subjects, intended to injure English commerce, but which fell in reality on that of France. The Directory also declared lawful prize all vessels, even neuter or friendly, freighted with English merchandise. Such was the beginning of that war upon English commerce, afterwards carried out on a gigantic scale by Bonaparte by his famous continental system.

Before assuming the command of the army of England, Bonaparte was to proceed as French plenipotentiary to Rastadt, where, agreeably to the Treaty of Campo Formio, a congress had assembled to arrange the terms of a peace between the French Republic and the German Empire. Bonaparte's journey to Rastadt resembled a triumphal march. All the towns through which he passed sent deputations to salute and compliment him. At Turin, he was received by the King of Sardinia with every mark of distinction; Geneva celebrated his arrival with public fêtes and illuminations; Bern prepared to honour him with a banquet, a ball, and other festivities. But the French revolutionists had long conceived a grudge against Bern, for reasons which will be explained further on; and, to the mortification of the Swiss patricians, Bonaparte haughtily declined to accept their hospitalities. He entered Rastadt on the evening of November 25th, in a carriage drawn by eight horses and surrounded by a guard of twenty-four hussars. Here he found a despatch from the Directory inviting him to Paris. The most important matter concluded by Bonaparte during his short stay at Rastadt was a secret military convention, arranged with Count Cobentzl, and signed December 1st,[7] intended to facilitate the execution of the secret treaty of Campo Formio.

[7] Martens, t. vi. p. 437.

The Emperor, in communicating the patent articles of that treaty to the German Diet, had invited them to send deputies to Rastadt to treat for a peace "on the basis of the integrity of the Empire." Yet, by this convention, the Imperial troops were to evacuate the fortresses of Mentz, Ehrenbreitstein, Philippsburg, Königstein, Mannheim, Ulm, Ingolstadt, and Würzburg; in short, to retire from the neighbourhood of the Rhine behind the Lech and the Inn, in order that the French might take possession of Mentz and the left bank of the Rhine. The Elector of Mentz and the Diet were to be moved to admit the French troops into that city; in case of refusal, the French Republic was to be authorised to effect a forcible entry. The Imperial troops, agreeably to this convention, evacuated Mentz on the night of December 9th, leaving in it only the troops of the Elector. The astonishment and dismay of the Princes of the Empire at being thus betrayed and deserted by their constitutional head may be better conceived than described. The mask had at length fallen, and the double game played by Francis became apparent. As head of the Empire, he had stipulated its integrity in the preliminaries of Léoben. But in the secret articles of the Treaty of Campo Formio, which he concluded only as King of Hungary and Bohemia, that stipulation had been abandoned; nay, he had agreed that if the war should be renewed he would furnish to the Empire only his contingent as Archduke of Austria, and remain neuter with regard to his other dominions. Mentz was now surrounded by the French troops, and, in spite of the remonstrances of the Elector, being threatened with a bombardment, was compelled to capitulate, December 28th 1797. It was only after this surrender was effected that the Austrians were admitted into Venice in the following January, though the secret Convention of December 1st 1797 stipulated their unconditional admission on December 30th. About the same time (January 25th), the French stormed and took the *tête de pont* of Mannheim, defended only by a few troops of the Bavarian Palatinate and of the Federation.[8]

Meanwhile Bonaparte had returned to Paris; when the Directors, in compliance with the public enthusiasm, but much against their own private inclination, received him with extraordinary pomp and solemnity in the court of the Luxembourg palace, December 10th. Talleyrand addressed the victor of Italy in a speech more remarkable for bombast and exaggerated adulation than for eloquence or good taste. As the cock salutes the early

[8] K. A. Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. Kap. 32.

dawn, prescient of the coming splendour, so none had a surer presage of the rising sun than the ex-bishop of Autun. The address of Bonaparte himself on presenting the Treaty of Campo Formio to the Directors, submitted to them before delivery and purged of some passages deemed too vivacious, was conceived in that stilted, sententious style which the admirer of Ossian mistook for the sublime. Barras, in his reply, observed that "Nature had exhausted all her riches to create Bonaparte—Bonaparte has meditated his conquests with the mind of Socrates, he has reconciled mankind with war!"[9] Bonaparte, however, was not a man to be fed with empty phrases, which nobody could appreciate better than himself. He seems to have been rather humiliated than gratified by his reception at the Luxembourg. He felt that it was his own place to command instead of being commanded; though at present, indeed, he would have been content with a seat in the Directory, in which two were now vacant; but he was put aside on the pretence that he had not attained the age required by the constitution.

In prosecution of the scheme for invading England, Bonaparte, accompanied by some intelligent general officers, paid a rapid visit early in February 1798 to the ports of Etaples, Ambleteuse, Boulogne, Calais, Dunkirk, Furnes, Nieuport, Ostend, and the Isle of Walcheren, for the purpose of forming a judgment as to the feasibility of the contemplated enterprise. The result was that he deemed it too hazardous. He would not, he told his friends, risk the fate of "la belle France," including, of course, his own fortunes, on so uncertain a throw of the dice. The conquest of the Turkish province of Egypt, which had long occupied his attention, as well as that of the Directory, was substituted for it. But before we relate that expedition, we must advert to two or three other schemes of aggression which the Directory now carried into execution.

We have already mentioned how the Directory, immediately after the fall of Mantua, had pressed Bonaparte to march to Rome and destroy the Papal Government; how that general deemed such a step at all events premature, and preferred to conclude with the Pope the Peace of Tolentino. The Directors, however, continued to cherish a plan which promised, at trifling risk, so rich a harvest of plunder and peculation; nor did Bonaparte entertain the same repugnance for it as previously to the arrangements for a peace with Austria. His elder brother Joseph was sent as ambassador to Rome in September 1797 for the purpose of troubling the waters and laying the foundations of a quarrel;[10] but as Joseph's indolent

[9] Montgaillard, t. v. p. 82, 83 sq.

[10] For the following see Botta, *Storia d'Italia dal* 1789 *al* 1814, t. ii. lib. xiii.: Duppa, *Brief account of the overthrow of*

and voluptuous habits seemed to promise but little activity, three young and fiery French generals, Duphot, Arrighi, and Sherlock, were subsequently appointed to assist him. With the same view of seizing Rome the French continued to occupy Ancona, although they had agreed to evacuate it at the general peace, alleging that a maritime war still continued. The great age of Pius VI., and a severe illness with which he was seized at this period, seemed at first to promise from his death an opportunity for effecting a revolution. Bonaparte instructed his brother, in case Pius should die, to strain every nerve to prevent the election of another Pope, and to effect a revolution in the government.[11] The recovery of Pius having disappointed these hopes, other expedients were resorted to for this purpose. Although the Pope's authority was menaced by a revolutionary party, he was compelled, by the threats of Bonaparte, to dismiss the Austrian general Provera, whom he had appointed to the command of the Papal troops. Disturbances broke out in several parts of the Pope's dominions. At Rome, the democrats proclaimed a republic, and similar scenes ensued at Corneto, Cività Vecchia, and other places. These insurrections were put down; but they caused Pius such alarm that he was compelled to recognise the Cisalpine Republic, by which they had been fomented. The Pope appealed to the French ambassador to intervene, who pretended to sympathise with his situation; but instead of affording aid he demanded the release of all the imprisoned patriots. Rome at this time swarmed with discontented and desperate men, at the head of whom was the Marquis Vivaldi. It was notorious that an insurrection was preparing and that its focus was at the Corsini Palace, the residence of the French embassy. On December 28th 1797 it broke out. The insurgents, who had been defeated in the early part of the day, having sought refuge in the evening within the neutral precincts of the ambassadorial residence, pursued by the Papal soldiers, Joseph Bonaparte, surrounded by the members of the legation, among whom was Duphot in full uniform, appeared in the court of the palace; when Duphot, drawing his sword and advancing towards the soldiers, as if to compel them to retire, was fired upon and received a mortal wound, and a few other persons were killed. Next day Joseph Bonaparte quitted Rome for Florence, and though the Papal Government made the most humble, nay, abject submissions, nothing could induce him to

the Papal Government; Lacrételle, t. xi.; De Merck, *Captivité et mort de Pie VI.* For the whole reign of Pius, Bourgoing, *Mém. hist. sur Pie VI. et son pontificat*, 2 vols. 8vo.

[11] Letter of Sept. 29th 1797 (*Corr. de Napoléon I.*, t. iii. p. 352).

return. There can be no doubt that he was the aggressor. He had overstepped his ambassadorial functions and violated the sovereignty of the Pope; but the opportunity for a quarrel was too good a one to be thrown away. Berthier, much against his inclination, was directed to march secretly and with all the expedition possible upon Rome, and there to organise a republic. In vain the Pope implored the aid of Naples, Austria, and Tuscany. Bonaparte averted their interference by pretending that the Directory, after the occupation of Rome, would come to an understanding with those Powers about its fate. If, however, Naples should stir in the matter, he threatened that war would be declared. The Cabinet of Vienna acquiesced so tamely in these proceedings that they did not even present a single note to the Directory in favour of Pius VI.

The French troops entered Rome February 10th 1798, and were received as friends. The Pope could resort to no other weapons for his protection than the spiritual ones of processions, prayer, and fasting. On February 15th the anniversary of Pius VI.'s elevation, the Papal chair was overthrown, and the Roman Republic proclaimed. The Pope received with dignity and resignation the news of his deposition. A scene of brigandage and rapine now ensued, which had been one of the chief objects of these proceedings. Berthier had proclaimed that property would be respected, and Pius had not attempted to remove his effects. Yet his palaces were stripped, their contents catalogued and sold with all the regularity of a broker acting under a writ of execution. The French armies in Italy were constantly followed by a horde of dealers and hucksters, tracking like vultures the scent of booty. The product of the spoils fell to the French generals and the agents of the Directors. Rome was mulcted in four million francs in specie, two millions in stores and provisions, and three thousand horses; and four cardinals, three princes, and other persons, were seized as hostages for the payment. The Papal arms were everywhere destroyed, the golden keys suppressed, titles and other distinctions abolished, gold lace, liveries, and ornaments of all kinds prohibited.

The Directory had determined that Pius should leave Rome. He was insulted with the proposal that he should assume the three-coloured cockade, when a pension would be awarded to him. To this offer the venerable old man replied: "I know no other uniform than that with which the Church has decorated me. My body is in the power of man, but my soul belongs to God alone. I recognise the hand which chastises at once the shepherd and his

flock: I adore it and submit. Of a pension I have no need; a sack to cover me, a stone whereon to lay my head, these are all my wants. They suffice for an old man who desires only to end his days in penitence." His refusal, which had been expected, was the signal for further violence and plunder. The remainder of his property was now confiscated. His private library, consisting of more than 40,000 volumes, was sold to a Roman bookseller; even the rings were stripped from his fingers. Foremost in these brutalities was the French commissary Haller, a Swiss Calvinist. On a stormy night towards the end of February, Pius was torn from his palace and conveyed like a prisoner to Sienna. A convent near that place in which he resided having been damaged by an earthquake, he took up his abode for a time at the *Certosa*, or Carthusian convent, near Florence. We shall here briefly recount the sequel of his fate.

When the French took possession of Tuscany, in March 1799, Pius was torn from that retreat, and carried to Briançon, a fortress in the High Alps surrounded with perpetual snows, a place to which regiments were sometimes sent by way of punishment. This coldblooded and systematic cruelty, worse than the Popes had experienced from their most barbarous conquerors, towards an amiable and invalid old man, whose long reign of more than twenty years is unsullied by a single instance of persecution or injustice, appears to have been chiefly the work of the fanatical La Réveillère-Lepeaux, chief of the sect calling themselves *théophilanthropistes*, or religious philanthropists! When that Director and his colleagues, Treilhard and Merlin, were expelled from the Luxembourg in the following June, the Government, touched with some compassion for the sufferings of the venerable Pontiff, caused him to be removed to the milder climate of Valence, in the Department of the Drome, where he expired at the age of eighty-two, August 29th 1799. He was interred without any of the honours due to his rank and character.

A few days after the expulsion of the Pope, four French commissaries arrived at Rome and established a constitution on the approved model, namely, two chambers and five directors with the title of consuls. These consuls were of course the mere puppets of the French Directory. The benefits to be expected from the new government were immediately displayed. On February 23rd the French generals having caused a grand funeral ceremony to be performed in honour of Duphot, took advantage of the occasion to plunder with more leisure and security. The churches as well as the palaces were pillaged; nothing was too high or too low for the

rapacity of these Gallic hordes. Inestimable objects of art were turned into money at a vile price; sacerdotal robes were submitted to the fire for the sake of the bullion in their embroidery; the shrubs in the gardens were dug up and sold; even the meanest kitchen utensils were not despised. What could not be sold was wantonly destroyed. The proceeds of this plunder were appropriated by generals of the staff and agents of the Directors. The army, so far from participating in them, had received no pay for five months, and many were without shirts or shoes. The arrival of Masséna at this juncture, to take the command instead of Berthier, who, from disgust at these scenes, had solicited his recall, produced a mutiny. The French garrison at Mantua, which was in the same condition, had already manifested their feelings by a formidable revolt. Masséna, who had made himself notorious by his brigandage and extortions in various parts of Italy, no sooner arrived in Rome than the officers assembled in the Pantheon, and, by their remonstrances and the spirit of insubordination which they displayed, ultimately drove him from his post.[12] He was succeeded by Gouvion St. Cyr. The conduct of the French also produced an insurrection of the Roman people. The inhabitants of the Trastevere, encouraged by the divisions in the French army, rose and massacred many of the French soldiers. Their example was followed by the peasantry of the Romagna. But these insurrections were put down with great slaughter by Murat.

Switzerland was the next victim of Gallic cupidity. An attack upon that country had been meditated by the Girondists. Bern especially had incurred the hatred of the French Government, as well from its aristocratic constitution as from the shelter it had afforded to French refugees, and the favour with which it was supposed to have regarded the anti-revolutionary movement at Lyon. But while the continental war lasted, it was found convenient to recognise Swiss neutrality, which, indeed, appears to have been maintained with a good faith that afforded no just ground of complaint. Already, during the Italian campaign, Bonaparte seems to have meditated the future subjugation of

[12] See the *Adresse des Officiers de l'armée de Rome au Directoire Exécutif*, in *Mém. d'un Homme d'état*, t. v. It must be added, however, that another version of the story of this mutiny, supplied by General Koch to the Comte de Garden, and inserted by the latter at the end of the sixth vol. of his *Hist. des Traités de Paix*, exculpates Masséna at the expense of Berthier. The latter, it is said, was the author of the plunder at Rome, in order to pay the garrison of Mantua, and Masséna had no share in it. The hatred against Masséna was, in a great degree, the effect of *esprit de corps* and dissensions between his division and the 3rd, or Bernadotte's, which jointly occupied Rome. The stories of Masséna's spoliations at Padua are treated as calumnies.

Switzerland, for the sake of the convenient military roads into South Germany and North Italy which the possession of it would afford. The annexation of the Italian cantons to the Cisalpine Republic formed part of this scheme, to the execution of which all obstacles appeared to be removed by the Peace of Campo Formio. The aid which the well-filled treasury of Bern, and the spoils which might be made in other Swiss towns, would afford towards the expedition against England, afterwards converted into that of Egypt, was not the least among the motives for the expedition.[13]

In a few of the cantons the designs of the French were aided by the inhabitants. The Swiss Constitution, the growth of the middle ages, was, in many instances under republican forms, a complete aristocracy, the Government being in the hands of a few powerful families. This was particularly the case in Bern, Freyburg, and Soleure. The cantons of Basle and Zurich were governed by the municipalities of those cities, a kind of civic aristocracy. The forest cantons were more democratical. In many places, political offices, as those of *landvogt* (governor or bailiff), judge, &c., almost monopolised by certain families, were looked upon as a kind of trade, and in some districts, such as the Thürgau, Aargau, and Pays de Vaud, the children, relatives, and *protégés* of the privileged classes were supported at the expense of the inhabitants. Of all the cantons Bern was the most important. Besides Aargau, Thürgau, and other subject districts, the Bernese had reigned, jointly with Freyburg, more than two centuries and a half over the Pays de Vaud, which, in consequence of disputes arising out of the Reformation, they had wrested in 1536 from the hands of the Bishop of Geneva and the Duke of Savoy, and which they treated as a conquered country. The rule of the patricians of Bern was, however, wise and moderate, although their pride and haughtiness offended all who did not belong to their *caste*.

It is not surprising that the doctrines of the French Revolution should have made some progress among certain portions of the Swiss, who, whatever might be their political liberty, could not boast of equality. Basle and the Pays de Vaud were the cantons in which French principles had made most progress. They were

[13] On this subject see Madame de Staël, *Consid. sur la Rév. Fr.*, P. iii. ch. 27; Montgaillard, t. v. p. 93; *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 461. Bourienne, in his *Mémoires*, asserts that Bonaparte took no share in the revolutionising of Switzerland. The contrary is proved, not only by his whole conduct, but also by his letter to the Directory of the Cisalpine Republic, Feb. 28th 1798, in which he says: "Nous dérirons en conséquence que vous vous serviez de tous les moyens que vous pouvez avoir pour répandre chez ces peuples, vos voisins (the Italian *bailliages*), l'esprit de liberté; faites répandre des imprimés libéraux; excitez-y *un mouvement qui accélère le mouvement général de la Suisse.*" *Corr. de Nap. I.* t. iii. p. 496. Cf. *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 330.

fomented in the former by Peter Ochs, *Oberzunftmeister*, or head of the corporation of Basle, the only person of importance among the Swiss magistracy who entertained the new ideas, and in the Pays de Vaud by Colonel Laharpe, a person of some influence, who had been tutor to the Archduke Alexander of Russia, afterwards Emperor. Laharpe had, on one or two occasions, excited insurrections, which, however, had been put down by the Bernese Government. Circumstances were more favourable to his plans, and those of Ochs, his fellow-labourer in the cause of revolution, towards the end of 1797. The Directory, soon after their establishment, had cast their eyes on Switzerland; emissaries had been despatched thither to sow the seeds of dissension; complaints had been raised about the conduct of the Bernese Government; and the dismissal, or rather the voluntary retirement, of the English minister, Wickham, whom they accused of abusing his ambassadorial functions by intriguing against France, had been effected. After the conclusion of the peace with Austria, the Directors began more openly to display their hostility. In December they caused their troops to occupy the Erguel and Münster-thal, belonging to the Bishopric of Basle, and on January 28th 1798, Mühlhausen was united by a formal treaty to France.[14] The peasantry of the canton of Basle seizing the conjuncture to assert their liberties, rose in insurrection, destroyed the *châteaux* of their bailiffs or governors; but the Council and Burgesses of Basle averted the storm by conceding to the peasantry equal privileges with the citizens. About the same time, Laharpe, having concerted his plans with the Directory, incited his fellow-subjects to rise. Talleyrand, Minister of Foreign Affairs, as a pretext for interference, disinterred some old treaties of the time of Charles IX. by which the French Government guaranteed the political rights of the Vaudois.[15] On December 28th the Directory notified to the Governments of Bern and Freyburg, that the members of them, by virtue of these ancient treaties, would be individually responsible for the persons and property of such inhabitants of the Pays de Vaud as might seek the mediation of the French Republic. At the same time, Masséna's division, under the command of Mesnard, was directed to march from Italy to the frontiers of the Pays de Vaud. The revolutionists of that country, thus encouraged, became more daring in their movements, while French emissaries spread themselves through the more aristocratic parts of Switzerland to

[14] Martens, t. vii. p. 656.

[15] Subsequently, under Henry III., in 1579, France received Geneva, as an ally of Switzerland, into its protection against the attempts of the Duke of Savoy. Martin, t. ix. p. 486.

excite discontent and revolt. The Bernese Government, on their side, invoked the aid of the other cantons; the oath of federation was renewed by all except that of Basle, and the *Tagsatzung*, or Diet, decreed the levy of a confederate army.

Before this force could assemble, Colonel Weiss was despatched with fourteen battalions to reduce the insurgent Vaudois, who, on his approach, claimed the assistance of Mesnard. The French general immediately entered the Pays de Vaud. Weiss retired to Yverdun without striking a blow, and Mesnard proclaimed at Lausanne, January 24th 1798, the independence of the Vaudois. Mesnard despatched an aide-de-camp with a message to Weiss, requiring the evacuation of the Pays de Vaud, but not having the proper watchword, two of the hussars of the aide-de-camp's escort were shot by a Bernese outpost stationed a few miles from Yverdun. This event afforded the French general an excellent handle to declaim against a breach of the law of nations, and to threaten the Bernese with hostilities. Weiss, alarmed by his menaces, now evacuated the Pays de Vaud, although he had 20,000 men while the French army numbered only 15,000, the victors of Italy, but in a state of destitution and covered with rags. But the Swiss were to supply their wants. Mesnard, on taking possession of the Pays de Vaud, mulcted his new allies, whom he had come to protect, in 700,000 francs; but they had the satisfaction of proclaiming themselves the *Lemanic Republic*.

A vigorous blow, rapidly delivered, might still have saved Bern. Such was the advice of Steiger, *Schultheiss*, or chief magistrate of Bern, and of Erlach von Hindelbank, under the old *régime* a general in the French service, who had been appointed to the command of the Bernese army in place of the incompetent Weiss. But the aristocrats of Bern betrayed the same weakness and indecision which had ruined Venice and Genoa. A majority in the Council were for negociating a peace, as well as awaiting the confederate reinforcements. In the hope of conciliating the French, they began to make some reforms in the Government, which only destroyed its authority and vigour without attaining the proposed end. The same course was adopted by several other cantons. The Bernese Government opened negociations with the Directory; but Mesnard did not arrest his march, while at the same time Schauenburg was advancing from the north with 17,000 men detached from the army of the Rhine. At this juncture General Brune assumed the command of the French army in Switzerland. Brune was instructed to play the part of a pacificator, and to amuse the Bernese with negociations till he should

be in a posture to strike a decisive blow. But the demands of the French were so insolent and extravagant, that even the peace party in the Bernese senate was roused from its lethargy, and a peremptory refusal was given. Their distracted counsels, however, paralysed all Erlach's operations. Symptoms of insubordination appeared in his army; and although confederate troops, to the number of 5000 or 6000, had arrived, they, for the most part, kept aloof and formed only a line of reserve. Meanwhile the French advanced from both sides with rapid marches. Scarcely had the armistice, which had been agreed upon expired, when Soleure and Freyburg were occupied. The Bernese gained some advantages at Neueneck, between Freyburg and Bern, March 5th, but the defeat of Erlach and Steiger, on the same day at Frauenbrunnen, decided the fate of Bern. After this defeat Steiger and Erlach, whose political principles had rendered them suspected, were pursued by the peasantry; Erlach was murdered, but Steiger succeeded in escaping to Vienna. The reduction of Freyburg, Soleure, and Bern, in the short space of five days, was the prelude to the subjugation of all Switzerland.

The work of conquest ended, that of plunder began. In specie, corn, wine, military stores, contributions, &c., Bern was robbed to the value of forty-two million francs, of which near eleven million consisted of money and bullion in the treasury. Of this sum, three million in specie were sent direct from Bern to Toulon, by order of Bonaparte, in aid of the expedition to Egypt.[16] Although war had been declared only against Bern, all Switzerland was treated as a conquered country, and large contributions were also exacted from Freyburg, Soleure, Zurich, and other places. But the Swiss were to be compensated for their losses by a constitution on the French model. Brune, by order of the Directory, was at first for dividing Switzerland into three republics, to be entitled Rhodania, Helvetia, and Tellguria. One advantage of this plan was to avoid the labour and danger of reducing the poor and warlike inhabitants of the forest cantons, from whom but little booty could be expected. But the patriots Ochs and Laharpe, who were intriguing at Paris in the interests of their country, were for a republic, one and indivisible, on the French model; and their views, being supported by Bonaparte and Talleyrand, at last prevailed. Schauenburg, now commander-in-chief of the French army, and the commissary Lecarlier, proclaimed the HELVETIC REPUBLIC at Aarau, April 12th. The details of the new constitution are said

[16] See his letter to Schauenburg, April 2nd 1798, in *Corr. de Napoleon I.* t. iv. p. 36. For an estimate of the Bernese spoils, *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 411.

to have been drawn up one evening in a Paris drawing-room by Madame de Staël, Talleyrand, and Benjamin Constant. Its general scheme of two Councils and a Directory was modelled on that of France. A treaty was concluded with Geneva,[17] and that town and its territory were united to France (April 26th.) Schauenburg and Lecarlier behaved in the most tyrannical manner towards the Swiss. Eleven members of the Bernese Government and five patricians of Soleure, were carried off as prisoners to the citadel of Strasburg; the churches and monasteries, as well as the public treasuries and arsenals, were everywhere plundered.

The forest cantons of Schwytz, Uri, Zug, Unterwalden, and Glarus, protected by their lakes and mountains, refused at first to be incorporated in the new republic. A force of about 10,000 men was raised, which, under the conduct of Aloys Reding, fought some bloody battles with the French at Schindelazi, Rothenthurm, and other places, and sometimes gained the advantage; but numerical superiority at length prevailed, and the refractory cantons consented to take the oath to the constitution. The tyranny and robberies of Rapinat, Lecarlier's successor, drove them in the following July to a desperate revolt; though the canton of Unterwalden was the only one that persisted in it. A small body of these hardy mountaineers fought a desperate battle with the French at Stantz, near the Lake of Lucerne, September 8th, and inflicted a heavy loss upon their invaders. But, being overpowered by numbers, the French wreaked their vengeance by a dreadful and indiscriminate slaughter, and by burning and plundering throughout the canton.

Thus was all Switzerland finally reduced to subjection, and added to the list of those new republics that followed in the train of France. The tyrants of the Luxembourg, the representatives of a spurious democracy, had the satisfaction of strangling liberty in its very cradle, and of corrupting at their source the virtues and principles of republicanism. A treaty of peace and alliance, signed at Paris, offensive and defensive, August 19th 1798,[18] reduced the Helvetic Republic under the vassalage of France. By this treaty were secured two military roads through Switzerland: one along the Rhine and left shore of the Lake of Constance to Southern Germany; the other through the Valois, ultimately communicating with the Cisalpine Republic by the Simplon Pass.[19]

[17] Martens, t. vii. p. 659.

[18] *Ibid.* t. vi. p. 466.

[19] For the preceding, see Mallet du Pan, *Essai hist. sur la destruction de la ligue et de la liberté Helvétique*; Zschokke, *Kampf. und Untergang der Schweitz. Berg und Wald Kantone.*

Europe had remained passive while the French Government, under the shadow of the Peace of Campo Formio, effected the overthrow of the Pope and the destruction of Swiss independence. It remained for France to obtain, under that treaty, the cession of the left bank of the Rhine. The French plenipotentiaries at Rastadt, Treilhard and Bonnier, the same who had negociated with Lord Malmesbury at Lille, proposed that cession as a *sine quâ non* for the basis of all negociations, and as an indemnity for the expenses incurred by France through *an unjust attack;* while the deputation of the Empire resorted to every artifice of delay and evasion. Bonaparte cut the matter short by a secret letter, addressed towards the end of February 1798, to Count Cobentzl, in which he observed that it was time "to finish this comedy of Rastadt;" that the Directory had fixed the 20th of March as the term of their deliberations, and that if the absolute cession of the left bank was not agreed upon by that time, the war would recommence by a formidable irruption into Germany.[20] Thugut and the Austrian Cabinet now yielded, and the cession was made by the period named. The principal object of the congress being thus accomplished, Bonaparte, intent upon the expedition to Egypt, obtained permission to withdraw altogether from Rastadt, leaving there his secretary and some of his household.

The tyranny and rapacity of the French Directory were displayed in other transactions besides the oppression and plunder of Switzerland and Rome. Their conduct towards the King of Sardinia affords another remarkable instance of their violence and bad faith. They had assured Charles Emanuel on his accession that they should never forget what he had done for France, when Prince of Piedmont; yet his devotion was rewarded by a continual series of humiliations and chagrins. The existence of his kingdom between France and the Cisalpine Republic was irksome and inconvenient to the Directors, who employed every method to ruin the unfortunate monarch by exacting contributions, which his kingdom was not in a condition to furnish, by fomenting insurrection among his subjects, and by setting on the Ligurian and Cisalpine Republics to attack and insult him. The Piedmontese rebels, secretly encouraged by France, and openly assisted by the Ligurians, attacked and defeated the King's troops under General Colli, at Carrosio, seized Seravalle, and created such consternation that Charles Emanuel was compelled to seek the aid of France. General Brune, who then commanded the French army in Italy,

[20] *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 231. The letter does not appear in the *Corr. de Nap. I.*

pretended that he could not accord it, unless he was put in possession of the citadel of Turin, which the Pentarchs had long coveted, in order to carry out their designs upon Piedmont. Charles Emanuel was weak enough to grant this demand by a convention signed at Milan June 28th 1798. Order was now restored, but the eventual price of it to the King was the loss of his dominions.[21] As the treatment of Sardinia was an instance of the tyranny of the Directory, so their conduct towards the United States of America betrays their avarice and venality. In consequence of the war declared against English commerce by the French Government, a rupture had taken place between France and the United States of North America. A vast and lucrative trade had grown up between Great Britain and her revolted colonies, and in November 1794, had been concluded between them a secret treaty of commerce and navigation, which had proved injurious to French trade. This and other causes had produced a serious misunderstanding, and in the autumn of 1797 envoys had been sent from America to Paris to arrange an accommodation. The first demand of the Directory, through Talleyrand, the foreign minister, was for a loan of forty-eight million francs; but the envoys were given to understand that this demand might be abandoned in consideration of a *douceur* of 1,200,000 francs, or about 50,000*l.* sterling, to be divided between Talleyrand and the director Barras.[22] While the American envoys were still in Paris, the Legislative Council passed a law, January 18th 1798, that the cargo determines whether a vessel be neuter or belligerent; in other words, they proclaimed the abandonment of the principle for which France had previously clamoured, that the flag covers the goods; and, in consequence, every vessel laden wholly or partly with English merchandise was declared lawful prize. Further, they declared that any foreign vessel which had put into an English port, except for unavoidable causes, could not enter a French one.[23] The Americans naturally regarded this law as a declaration of war, but hostilities did not actually ensue. In like manner the Directory had required a loan of twelve millions, and the cession of Cuxhaven from the towns of Hamburg, Lubeck, and Bremen; but France was not yet in a position to enforce these unjust and insolent demands. The Directory concluded a compulsory treaty,[24] March 20th, with the Cisalpine Republic, whose "liberty and independence" they recognised and guaranteed. Yet the third article of the treaty, by placing the military force of

[21] Botta, libr. xv.

[22] See the relation of the American envoys ap. *Homme d'état*, t. vi. p. 13 sqq.

[23] Garden, t. vi. p. 123.

[24] Martens, t. vi. p. 450 sqq.

the new republic entirely at the disposal of the Directory, virtually subjected it to France. The ratification of the treaty having been rejected at Milan by the Council of Ancients, Berthier was directed to arrest twenty-one members of that assembly, and the remainder then submitted and ratified. Such was the liberty allowed by French republicanism! We have already seen that Portugal had been compelled to purchase a peace from the Directory, and that the Court of Lisbon had forwarded a tardy ratification of it, December 1st 1797. But the indiscretion of the Portuguese ambassador Aranjo upset all that had been done. The venality of some members of the French Government being notorious, a large amount in diamonds was forwarded to Aranjo, to procure pardon for the delay of the ratification. But he distributed them so imprudently among the retainers of Barras and Talleyrand, that the Directory, in spite of his ambassadorial character, caused him to be arrested and confined in the Temple.

The relations between France and Portugal were closely connected with those between France and Spain. The Prince of the Peace showed himself, at this time, the friend and protector of Portugal. He had caused the Spanish troops to be withdrawn from the Portuguese frontier; and in return for this proceeding, as well as in consideration of his marriage with a relative of the Queen of Portugal, the Court of Lisbon conferred upon him the principality of Evora. As these things were, of course, distasteful to the French Directory, who, moreover, were dissatisfied with the lukewarmness exhibited by Spain in prosecuting the war with England, they determined to overthrow Godoy, and to effect a revolution in the Spanish Cabinet. With this view Admiral Truguet was despatched early in 1798, as ambassador to Madrid. Aware of his mission, the Prince of the Peace affected to act with more vigour; ordered a *sortie* of the Spanish fleet from Cadiz, February 6th, where twenty-four sail of the line were blockaded by only eight English vessels: but the news that Lord St. Vincent, with the remainder of the English fleet, was preparing to sail from the Tagus, induced the Spaniards to return to port. Truguet, finding that he could not stimulate them to action, and that they had no serious intention of attacking Portugal, resolved to effect the disgrace of Godoy. He delivered to Charles IV., on the part of his Government, a private letter, in which was revealed the nature of the connection between his Queen and the Prince of the Peace. The information was not, perhaps, altogether new to the Spanish monarch; he appears not to have manifested any very serious disgust or astonishment; but the extraordinary proceeding

of the French ambassador had transpired, and he could not avoid taking some steps to vindicate his honour. A few days after, Godoy was removed from his post of private secretary to the Queen, in which he was succeeded by the minister of finance, Don Francisco Saavedra. At the same time De Mallo, a young *garde-du-corps*, of athletic figure, appointed major-domo of the palace, replaced Godoy in the more private service of the Queen. The disgrace of Godoy was, however, only apparent and political; he continued to reside at Aranjuez, and Charles IV. retained for him all his former friendship.

Saavedra belonged to the French party in the Spanish counsels. His accession to power was signalised by the dismissal from Spain of all emigrant French royalists, and the prohibition of English merchandise. The Directory continued to press the armed intervention of Spain, in order to compel Portugal to separate herself from England, and become a member of the French political system. But Godoy, though defeated, was not vanquished, and he managed by his intrigues to procure the recall of Truguet. Godoy seems to have been one of the first men in Europe who discovered that Egypt was the destination of the French armaments. It was through Madrid and Lisbon that the English Cabinet first received positive assurance of that fact. They had continued to think that the vast preparations at Brest, Toulon, Genoa, Civitâ Vecchia, and Cadiz were directed against Great Britain; and when their true destination was known, it was too late to blockade Toulon. But the threatened invasion of England was in fact only a blind.

Leibnitz had suggested the occupation of Egypt by the French in the reign of Louis XIV., but the project of that philosopher appears to have slumbered on the shelves of the library at Hanover. The scheme was revived in 1781. The Turkish monarchy, it was thought, would fall to pieces under the attacks of Catherine II., and it was in contemplation, instead of defending it, to secure a share of its spoils. The execution of this plan was urgently pressed by Count St. Priest, French ambassador at Constantinople, whose *Mémoire sur la Turquie* is reckoned a model of its kind;[25] but circumstances caused it to be adjourned. Thus Republican France was not the first to contemplate this unjust aggression. It was, however, Magallon, French consul at Cairo, who suggested to the Directory in 1796 the expedition that was actually executed. In the following year the subject engaged the attention of Bonaparte, then in Italy. The possession of the Ionian Islands by the conquest

[25] Pelet de la Lozère, *Opinions de Napoléon*.

of Venice, seemed to facilitate French intervention in the affairs of the Turkish Empire, and the augmentation of French power and commerce in the East; above all, the possession of Egypt would be, it was thought, a sure step towards the ruin of England.[26] The scheme in itself suited the genius of Bonaparte. To carry his arms into the ancient and almost fabulous country of Egypt, was an exploit calculated to dazzle the imagination of the French, and to increase the prestige of his military glory. The Directory, on their side, hesitated not to embrace a project which would deliver them for some time from a general whose presence was importunate, and might ultimately prove his ruin. The capture of Malta seemed to Bonaparte a necessary preliminary. The Knights of Malta were poor and almost defenceless; he had already, with a view to this stroke, confiscated all their possessions in Italy. His armies were composed of men to whom all religions were indifferent. Mahometans, Copts, Arabs, idolaters, all would be treated alike.[27] The Knights of Malta, or St. John of Jerusalem, who were to be thus sacrificed, had done nothing to provoke the hostility of France. They had observed a strict neutrality in the war, though they had opportunities to annoy French commerce, and enrich themselves by privateering. To facilitate the capture of Malta, Poussielgue, secretary to the Genoese Legation, was despatched thither to form a French party, disseminate republican opinions, and undermine the Order; while in the spring, Admiral Brueys touched at the island with his squadron, sounded all the coasts, and sent one of his vessels into the harbour, under pretence of repairs, in order to reconnoitre.

In May 1798 the expedition was ready to sail from Toulon to invade the dominions of a friendly Power which had not given France the slightest provocation, and for which the Directory, through its ambassador, had solemnly professed only a few months before the sincerest friendship.[28] Four thousand transports had been collected to convey an army of near 40,000 men, under convoy of Admiral Brueys' fleet. To temper the lustre of the French arms with the milder glories of science, literature, and art, a band of 100 *savans* and artists was to accompany the expedition. But an untoward accident threatened to interrupt it just on the eve of its sailing. Bernadotte had been despatched ambassador to Vienna to tranquillise the Imperial Court as to the proceedings of the

[26] Bonaparte's Letter to the Directory, Milan, August 16th 1797 (*Corr. de Nap. I.* t. iii. p. 235).

[27] Letter to Talleyrand, Passariano, Sept. 13th 1797; *Ibid.* p. 293.

[28] Auber Dubayet's note to the Reis-effendi, Aug. 28th 1797, ap. *Homme d'état*, t. vi. p. 268.

French Government against Rome and Switzerland. The Directory having found fault with him for not openly displaying in the Austrian capital the national cockade and other emblems of republicanism, Bernadotte was imprudent enough to fix a three-coloured flag, with the inscription "liberty and equality," over the gateway of his hotel at the very time when the people were celebrating the anniversary of their levy *en masse* in the preceding year to oppose the advance of Bonaparte. The Viennese, indignant at this insult to their government, vented their anger by breaking the ambassador's windows, and tearing down and destroying the flag. Bernadotte, not having succeeded in extorting from the Imperial Court the humiliating satisfaction which he required, namely, a disavowal of these proceedings by the Austrian Government, the punishment of the ringleaders, and the replacing of the obnoxious flag by the hands of an Austrian officer, he quitted Vienna with all the members of the legation, April 15th. This step filled the Directory with dismay and confusion. The national honour was at stake; they could not disavow Bernadotte; yet a war with Austria would delay, if not frustrate, the Egyptian expedition whose departure had been fixed for April 23rd. Consideration for the national honour seemed to prevail; but in this dilemma they intrusted the management of affairs to Bonaparte. That general was for maintaining the peace with Austria; to go to war with that Power, he observed, was to play the game of England, and he despatched a letter to Cobentzl from which it might easily be inferred that a moderate apology would be accepted. But at the same time he countermanded the sailing of the expedition till the affair should be arranged; nay, he even expressed an opinion that, in the unsettled state of Europe, it should be definitively postponed to a more favourable season. These views, the haughty and dictatorial tone assumed by Bonaparte, filled the Directors with alarm. Already they seemed to hear the voice of a master. In a stormy interview, May 3rd, the five Directors gave him positive orders to depart immediately. Resorting to a familiar *ruse*, Bonaparte threatened to resign, when Rewbel coolly handed him a pen, observing: "The Republic no doubt will lose a brave and skilful chief, but she has other children who will not abandon her." Bonaparte took the pen, but Merlin snatched it from him and put an end to the scene. As the general quitted the Luxembourg he observed to one of his confidants: "Let us go—*the pear is not yet ripe*—we will return at the proper season."[29]

Such were the feelings with which Bonaparte sailed for Egypt,

[29] *Homme d'état*, t. v. p. 513 sq.

May 19th,[30] a glorious foreign conquest his immediate object, in the background visions of domination at home as the result of it. Among the generals who accompanied him were Berthier, Kléber, Murat, Junot, Desaix, Davoust, Lannes, Menou, and others. The French fleet arrived at Malta June 9th. Seduction had done its work. Only a feeble defence was made by the Knights, and on the night of the 11th a capitulation was signed.[31] It was the work not of the Grand Master, Baron Hompesch, a German, but of five *soi-disant* representatives of the Order. Small annuities were granted to the Knights and an apparently liberal compensation to the Grand Master, out of the greater part of which, however, he was subsequently defrauded. The treasure of St. John was seized, the plate of the hospital and churches of the Order was converted into ingots; all the ships, guns, and military stores were appropriated by the invaders; all the soldiers and sailors in the island were pressed into the French service. The Knights were ordered to leave Malta in three days, the Russian minister in three hours. Thus was overthrown this singular government, which had subsisted without alteration since 1530. It had long ceased to be of any utility. The military exercises of the Knights were a mere form. Their sole ambition was to obtain a commandery whose revenues they for the most part consumed in dissipation and debauchery. But this affords no justification for the unlawful attack upon them and capture of their island.

Bonaparte sailed from Malta June 19th. By taking a circuitous route he escaped the English fleet that was in search of him, and landed safely at Marabou, in Egypt, July 1st. The Mamelukes, who then ruled in Egypt, were unprepared for defence. Alexandria was immediately taken and occupied, and the march was then resumed for Cairo. Proclamations in Arabic were circulated among the people, purporting that the object of Bonaparte's expedition was to deliver the Egyptians from the tyranny of their masters; that he respected God, his prophet, and the Koran a great deal more than did the Mamelukes; and he appealed, in proof that he was no Christian, to the overthrow of the Pope and of the Knights of Malta.[32] At Chébréisse the Mamelukes delivered their first attacks, but could make no impression on the French squares. Ascending the Nile to the apex of the Delta, Bonaparte learned that the Mamelukes, under

[30] For the Egyptian expedition, of which we can give but the bare outline, see Berthier, *Relation des campagnes du génl. Bonaparte en Egypte et en Syrie*; Savary, *Mémoires*, t. i. ch. 2—5; *Hist. scient. et milit. de l'expédition Fr. en Egypte*, 10 tom. 8vo. For the taking of Malta, Boisgelin, *Hist. of Malta*, vol. ii. b. iii.

[31] Martens, t. vi. p. 322.

[32] See the *Proclamation*, in *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. iv. p. 191.

their Beys, with Arabs and *fellahs*, amounting in all to 30,000 men were entrenched between Embabeh and Giseh in the plain of the Pyramids, opposite Cairo. Bonaparte animating his soldiers before the attack by pointing to the Pyramids, reminded them that forty centuries looked down upon them, and in spite of the desperate valour displayed by the Mamelukes, led by Murad Bey, the French gained a complete victory (July 21st). This battle, called the Battle of the Pyramids, overthrew the government of the Mamelukes and opened Cairo to the French, which capital they entered on the following day. One of the first acts of Bonaparte on taking possession of Cairo, was to invite the Pasha of Egypt to return, and to assure him that he should enjoy the consideration due to his rank.[33] He had been forced to accompany the flight of the Mameluke Bey Ibrahim, who commanded a force on the eastern side of the Nile, and who, after the defeat of Murad, retreated to Belbeis. Bonaparte pursued him, and defeated his rear guard at Salehieh, August 17th. The Bey then fled to Syria and Bonaparte returned to Cairo. Murad Bey had fled into Upper Egypt.

It would be superfluous to recapitulate to the English reader events which must be so present to his mind as Nelson's pursuit of the French fleet, the narrow chance by which he missed it, his exulting joy on discovering it moored in the Bay of Aboukir, the glorious and decisive Battle of Aboukir, or the Nile, August 1st and 2nd, and the almost total destruction or capture of Admiral Brueys' fleet. The details of this action will be found in all the histories of England, and instead of recounting them we shall here rather apply ourselves to develope the effects of this great and splendid victory.

Few naval engagements have been attended with consequences so important as those of the battle of Aboukir. It destroyed a third part of the naval force of France and a great number of her best sailors, gave Great Britain an irresistible superiority in the Mediterranean, annihilated French commerce in the Levant, dissipated all hope of conquest in Egypt, and reduced the French expedition to that country to a mere military descent, without the hope of reinforcement or retreat, in which the invading army must perish by its own triumphs. Its effects upon the opinions and policy of Europe were still more important and remarkable. Except in France, the news of the battle of Aboukir was hailed throughout the Continent with a universal joy. The nations that had been

[33] Letter to the Pasha, July 22nd, *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. iv. p. 241.

humiliated and oppressed beheld a chance of their deliverance, and hastened to form a new Coalition against France, in which the Ottoman Porte, her ancient ally, was to be strangely combined against her, with Russia, the natural enemy of the Turks. But before we relate the formation of this league we must revert to some transactions which preceded it.

While nearly all the Continent cowered under French insolence and domination, England alone carried on the war with spirit and perseverance. Her firmness and constancy, the noble attitude which she assumed in the midst of unparalleled dangers, made her the hope of Europe. Hence she became the chief object of the hatred and suspicion of the Directory. All the mischances of France were attributed to English intrigues and machinations, and England was regarded in that country, like Carthage by ancient Rome, as the invidious and implacable rival of her power and glory. The Directory, although compelled to abandon the scheme of a descent upon England itself, still entertained the hope of being able to strike a blow at her rival by means of Ireland, now, through the agitations of the United Irishmen, Whiteboys, Defenders and other revolutionary associations, in a state of open insurrection. Armaments were prepared at Rochefort, Brest, and Dunkirk, which were intended to sail for Ireland in the spring of 1798, but notwithstanding the instances of the Irish rebels, the attempt was deferred till its success was compromised through the putting down of the insurrection and the capture of some of its principal leaders. General Humbert, with the smallest armament, only sailed from Rochefort August 2nd. He succeeded in landing about 1100 men at Killala, and at first met with some success; but at Ballynamuch he was defeated by the viceroy of Ireland, Lord Cornwallis, in person, and compelled to surrender with his whole force (Sept. 8th). At the news of Humbert's first successes, a larger squadron, under Admiral Bompart, consisting of the Hoche, a line-of-battle ship, and eight frigates, having on board about 3000 men commanded by General Hardy, put to sea September 25th. This division, however, did not even effect a landing. The Hoche and three of the frigates were captured by Sir John Borlase Warren, October 11th; three of the remaining frigates, which had got into the Bay of Killala, were subsequently taken, and only two succeeded in escaping to France. Wolf Tone, one of the chiefs of the Irish insurrection, was captured on board the Hoche, tried, and condemned to be hanged; but escaped that ignominious fate by committing suicide with a penknife.[34]

[34] Adolphus, *Reign of George III.*, vol. vii. p. 76 sqq.

Some attempts of the English on the coasts of France were not more successful than these French expeditions. Havre was bombarded without effect by Sir Richard Strahan, May 24th; while an expedition to Ostend under Sir Home Popham, although it attained its object of destroying the sluices of the Bruges Canal, and thus interrupting the internal navigation between France and Holland, purchased this success by the loss of all the troops engaged in the undertaking. These consisted of about 1000 men under General Coote, who, being prevented by the heavy surf from re-embarking, were surrounded by superior forces and compelled to surrender.[35] These reverses, however, were far more than compensated by the success of the English fleets in the Mediterranean; where, besides the capture of Gozza, a small island dependent upon Malta. Minorca was taken by Admiral Duckworth and a military force under the Hon. Charles Stuart.[36]

But, as France was unable to cope with her rival at sea, so England alone was powerless against France on land. Hence her views were constantly turned to the maintenance of a Coalition, which she was willing to support with her treasures. After the defection of Prussia she had turned her eyes towards Russia, and the relations with that country had been drawn closer by a treaty of commerce, negociated by Sir Charles Whitworth in May 1797. Paul I., as we have seen, had, on his accession to the Muscovite throne, countermanded the preparations of his mother Catherine for taking an active part against the French. He was nevertheless a determined enemy of the Revolution and of the government of the Directory, and events led him by degrees to become one of their principal opponents. After the defeat of the attempts upon the French frontier, Paul had taken into his pay the Prince of Condé and his army, and had assigned to Louis XVIII. a residence at Mittau, in Courland, with a pension of two million roubles. He had displayed his good will to England and his hatred of the Directory by ordering the equipment of twenty-two ships of the line and a great number of galleys, in consequence of a decree of the Directory, January 12th 1798, prohibiting any vessel laden with English merchandise from being allowed to pass the Sound. The proceedings of the French during that year, and the conduct of their plenipotentiaries at the Congress of Rastadt, led him to take a more active part against them.

The Congress of Rastadt presents a revolting spectacle of Gallic rapacity and insolence, of German disunion, selfishness, and weakness. The French plenipotentiaries, Treilhard and Bonnier, the

[35] Adolphus, *Reign of George III.*, vol. vii. p. 86. [36] *Ibid.* p. 116.

same who had negociated with Lord Malmesbury at Lille, as if bent on exciting a fresh war, proceeded from one insufferable demand to another, and adopted towards the slow and formal but courteous diplomatists of Germany all the haughtiness of republican pride combined with the *brusquerie* and rudeness of *sans-culottism*. Never before had so much *morgue* been united with such vulgar and brutal manners. Treilhard having been nominated to a seat in the Directory, was succeeded by Debry; who, when a member of the Convention, had proposed the forming of a legion of regicides. Ultimately, indeed, but not till July, the Directory despatched Roberjot, ex-curé of Mâcon, a man of enlightened and benevolent character, to temper the violence and heal the dissensions of his colleagues. On the German side jealousy, suspicion, and treachery prevailed, while the French ministers took care to foment these passions in order to weaken Germany and render it an easier prey. Of the smaller German princes many were ready to desert the national cause and seek, for their own selfish ends, the protection of France.

We have already mentioned that the deputation of the Empire had admitted the cession of the left bank of the Rhine to France as one of the bases of negociation: on April 2nd they also admitted the principle of secularisation as the method of compensating the princes that were to be dispossessed. It remained to discuss and arrange all the particulars included in these general bases. The French plenipotentiaries threw off the mask in their note of May 3rd, by demanding, in addition to the left bank of the Rhine, that the navigation of that river should be common to both nations, that the French should have liberty to cross from one towing-path to another, that all the islands of the Rhine, which would constitute a tolerable principality, should be made over to France, that the fortress of Ehrenbreitstein should be demolished, with other extravagant demands of the same kind.[37]

Matters were in this state when Paul I. sent Prince Repnin to Berlin, without, however, any formal diplomatic character, to reconcile the Courts of Berlin and Vienna, and to induce them to make common cause against France. Austria had agreed to renounce her pretensions to Bavaria, provided Prussia gave up all claim to compensation in Germany for her possessions on the left bank of the Rhine; and Prince Repnin succeeded in arranging this matter on the basis of mutual renunciation. But his attempts to bring the King of Prussia into a league against France were wholly

[37] Garden, t. vi. p. 52.

unsuccessful. The Russian envoy was here opposed by Sieyès, whom the Directory, dreading a rupture with Austria after the affair of Bernadotte, had despatched to Berlin to negociate an alliance with that court. To keep alive the jealousy between Prussia and Austria, Sieyès communicated to the Cabinet of Berlin the secret articles of the Treaty of Campo Formio, which had long been the object of their curiosity and suspicion. But Frederick William III., guided by the counsels of Haugwitz, declined alike the advances of France and Russia and resolved on preserving a strict neutrality.

The Austrian Cabinet, on the other hand, determined to accept the support of Russia. Thugut, who had been dismissed from the ministry as adverse to France, was now recalled, and Cobentzl was despatched to Berlin to support the negociations of Prince Repnin; after which he was to proceed to St. Petersburg. Prince Repnin arranged at Berlin with Count Cobentzl the preliminaries of an alliance between Russia and Austria; and having proceeded to Vienna, he concluded a formal treaty between the two courts early in September. This treaty has never been divulged, but the nature of it may be inferred from subsequent events. Before the close of 1798, 60,000 Russian troops under the command of Suvaroff were placed at the disposal of Francis II. and marched in three columns into the Austrian provinces.[38]

If the Czar was disposed to take part against the French before the capture of Malta by Bonaparte, the inclination was increased tenfold by that event. Paul I., who was of a romantic temper, in fact a little deranged, had entertained from his boyhood a singular predilection for the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. He had evinced his affection for the Order by restoring to it the revenues of the Grand Priory of Ostrog, in Volhynia,[39] which had passed under the Russian dominion in 1793; he even augmented those revenues, and founded several new Priories and Commanderies. The Grand Master and Council of Malta, in token of their gratitude, sent Paul the cross which had been worn by the celebrated La Valette, and besought him to accept the title of Protector of the Order. When the news of the surrender of Malta arrived in St. Petersburg, the Knights of the Grand Priory of Russia solemnly deposed Hompesch, the Grand Master, and degraded from their rank and dignity, as unworthy, infected, and corrupted members,

[38] Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. vi. p. 147.

[39] By a convention concluded Jany. 15th 1797. Martens, t. vi. p. 308. On Paul's connection with the Knights of Malta, see *Paul I., als Grossmeister des Malteser Ordens.*

all the knights who had accepted that infamous capitulation. On the 27th of October, the Russian knights, as well in their own name as that of those of the other tongues, proclaimed Paul I. their Grand Master, a ridiculous farce, for which they had neither right nor authority. The Czar, however, not only accepted the dignity, but displayed the interest which he took in the Order by framing new regulations for its discipline and government. He resolved to make it the first military institution in Europe, and a common centre for all the nobility of every nation who were interested in the support of royalty, and in setting bounds to the flood of Jacobinism and infidelity. At the same time merit and learning were not forgotten. Men of whatever Christian sect, who had distinguished themselves by their courage, their talents, or their learning, though not of noble birth, were declared admissible into the Order, and were to enjoy equal privileges with those of higher rank. From this class were to be selected the tutors of a college, to be founded in the chief residence of the Order. By accepting this Grand Mastership, Paul, the head of the schismatical Greek Church, acknowledged the Roman Pontiff as his superior. But he had formed the extravagant scheme not only of uniting the Catholic and Greek rites, but also of bringing the Lutherans, Calvinists, and Zwinglians into the same union.[40]

At the news of the capture of Malta, the Russian fleet at Sebastopol was immediately ordered to prepare to join Nelson; while Bonaparte's invasion of Egypt gave rise to an alliance between Russia and the Ottoman Porte. Sultan Selim III. was naturally exasperated at this unprovoked and treacherous act on the part of the most ancient ally of Turkey. In order to deprecate an anger which he had foreseen, Bonaparte had no sooner taken possession of Alexandria, than he instructed the French *chargé d'affaires* at Constantinople to convince the Porte of the firm resolution of the French to live on friendly terms with it.[41] Bonaparte was at this time in hopes that Talleyrand would have accepted the embassy to the Porte, on whose diplomatic skill he relied to convince the Sultan and his Divan that the French invasion of Egypt was, in reality, a friendly act; in short, that black was white. But the ex-bishop of Autun was too sagacious to risk on so desperate a cast the chance of being shut up in the Seven Towers, and the embassy was conferred on Ruffin. The conquest of Egypt, however, was only part of the French general's machinations against Turkey. He contemplated nothing less than exciting a revolt in

[40] *Homme d'état*, t. vii. p. 216.

[41] *Corr. de Nap. I.* t. iv. p. 223.

Macedonia, and all the Greek portion of the Turkish Empire; and with that view he had despatched Lavalette, immediately after the conquest of Malta, to Ali Pasha, of Janina;[42] but Ali turned a deaf ear to the proposal. Ruffin endeavoured to persuade the Porte that Bonaparte's intention was only to chastise the Mameluke Beys in Egypt; but he was placed in confinement, together with all the members of the legation. The Grand Vizier and the Mufti, suspected of being the accomplices of the French, were deposed from their high dignities, and the former was banished to the Isle of Scio. An alliance was formed with the Court of St. Petersburg, the Russian fleet was admitted through the Dardanelles, was received with every mark of honour, and visited by the Sultan in person. Outside the straits it was joined by the Turkish fleet, and for the first, and perhaps the last time, the Russian flag waved in cordial union with the Crescent. On the 20th September, the combined fleets sailed for the Archipelago, agreeably to instructions from Nelson, under whose command they were placed. They were destined to reduce the Ionian Islands, while the English took upon themselves the blockade of Malta. Sultan Selim testified his gratitude to Nelson by presenting him with a magnificent pelisse, and a diamond *aigrette* worth several thousand pounds, taken from his own turban. Paul also made some valuable presents to the English admiral.

The alliance between the Czar and the Sublime Porte was definitively concluded by the Treaty of Constantinople, December 23rd 1798.[43] The two Powers were henceforth to have the same friends and the same enemies, and they mutually guaranteed each other's possessions, including Egypt. Great Britain acceded to this treaty January 5th 1799.[44] The Porte also declared war against Holland, and on dismissing the Dutch ambassador from Constantinople, intimated that the good understanding between the Republic and the Sublime Porte should be restored so soon as the former separated itself from France: "a separation, it added, which will be conformable to its interests, and which will restore it to its ancient dignity." The Coalition was consolidated by the Treaty of St. Petersburg between Great Britain and Russia, December 29th 1798.[45] This last alliance was founded on the hope of drawing Prussia into the Coalition, and provided in that case for the furnishing of an army of 45,000 men by the Czar, and the payment of them by Great Britain. Lord Grenville undertook an embassy

[42] See his letters to Lavalette and the Pasha, Malta, June 17th 1798. *Corr. de Nap. I.* t. iv. p. 166 sq.

[43] Martens, t. vi. p. 532.

[44] *Ibid.* p. 668.

[45] *Ibid.* p. 557.

to Berlin, with the view of persuading Frederick William III. to abandon his system of neutrality, but without success. As the Prussian King would not accept the forces offered by the Czar, it was subsequently agreed between Russia and Great Britain that they should be employed in some other manner.

The second Coalition against France included, at first, Ferdinand IV., King of the Two Sicilies; and, as it was in the Neapolitan dominions that the continental war was resumed, we must take up their history at a rather earlier period.

The tyrannical behaviour of the Directory and its generals towards the King of Sardinia, the manifest ambition of the new Cisalpine Republic, the ruin which had overtaken the Roman Pontiff and the States of the Church,—all concurred to convince Ferdinand IV., the only Italian sovereign, except the Grand Duke of Tuscany, whose dominions still remained intact, of the fate which awaited himself. In order to avoid it, he endeavoured at once to fortify himself with powerful alliances, and to conciliate, so far as might be possible, the good will of the French Republic. With the latter view he dismissed his minister Acton, who was regarded by the French as devoted to England, and appointed in his place the Marquis de Gallo, the negociator of the Peace of Campo Formio. But, at the same time, he kept up a formidable army on the frontiers of the new Roman Republic, and he occupied the duchy of Benevento, which, though enclosed in his dominions, had formerly made part of the States of the Church. The new government at Rome, on the other hand, had confiscated Ferdinand's possessions in that capital, derived from the succession of the Farnese family, and had even played the farce of citing him to do homage for his crown to the Roman people, as successors of the Pope, his former suzerain.

The mission of M. Garat to the Court of Naples, on the part of the French Government, seemed for a time to have removed all asperities. Ferdinand was put in possession of the duchy of Bevevento and the principality of Ponte Corvo, in consideration of his paying a sum of money and renouncing his possessions at Rome: and on April 17th 1798 he received the oath of fidelity from his new subjects. But, knowing how little the friendship of France was to be relied on, he sought the support of an Austrian alliance. A treaty was concluded at Vienna, May 19th 1798, between the Duke of Campochiaro and Baron Thugut, by which, in the prospect of the fresh troubles which threatened Europe, and Italy in particular, it was agreed that the Austrian and Neapolitan monarchs should keep for their mutual defence a certain number of men on

foot, ready to march at the shortest notice. The Emperor, on his side, engaged to keep 60,000 men in Italy and the Tyrol, and Ferdinand 30,000 on his frontiers, nearest to the Austrian possessions: to be increased on both sides in case of need.[46]

This treaty, which was a secret one, having been betrayed to the Directory, their minister Garat began in July to put forth new pretensions. He demanded the release of all persons imprisoned for political opinions, the assignment of the port of Messina to France, and the exclusion of the English from all the other ports of the Two Sicilies. The last two conditions Ferdinand refused as incompatible with his dignity; but he opened the prisons, and inundated Naples with Jacobins, who applied themselves to create fresh troubles and confusion. Ferdinand, more convinced than ever of the hostile projects of the Directory, now made the most vigorous preparations for war. All men, from the age of seventeen to forty-five years, were called into active service, and the command-in-chief of the Neapolitan forces was conferred on the Austrian general Mack, the pupil of Lacy and Loudon, who enjoyed at that time the highest reputation for military talent.

Such was the posture of affairs when the news of Nelson's victory at Aboukir created an indescribable sensation at the Court of Naples. The fascinating but too notorious Lady Hamilton, the wife of the English ambassador, made Nelson her hero, inspired the King and Queen, whose favourite she was, with the same enthusiasm that animated herself. Acton recovered his former influence, and lending his support to the views of the English Cabinet, formed, with the Queen, the project of open war against the French Republic. Alarmed at these symptoms, the French *chargé d'affaires* demanded that Acton should be expelled the kingdom; that the commandant of Syracuse, who had allowed the English fleet to revictual in that port, should be sent in chains to France; that the King should reduce his troops to 10,000 men; and that he should admit French garrisons into all his ports. But Ferdinand, instead of listening to these complaints, only pushed on more actively his preparations for war. The appearance of Nelson with part of his fleet in the Bay of Naples, September 22nd, increased the confidence of the King and the enthusiasm of the court and people. At the instance of Sir William Hamilton and Nelson, who represented an immediate declaration of war as the only means of putting an end to the delays and tergiversations of Austria, it was resolved at a council held October 12th to commence hostilities so soon as the

[46] Garden, t. vi. p. 79.

army could be prepared to take the field. The return of Nelson, November 5th, who had left Naples for a while to superintend the blockade of Malta, confirmed Ferdinand in his warlike resolutions. He had now strengthened himself by alliances with Russia and Great Britain. The first of these was definitively concluded by the Treaty of St. Petersburg, November 29th 1798,[47] by which the Czar, besides the succour of his fleet united with that of the Porte, promised to furnish nine battalions of infantry, with the necessary artillery, and 200 Cossacks. The treaty with Great Britain, signed at Naples December 1st,[48] renewed a former convention of July 12th 1793. England was to keep in the Mediterranean, till the peace, a fleet decidedly superior to that of the enemy; to which the King of the Two Sicilies was to add as his contingent four ships of the line, four frigates, and four smaller vessels, with 3000 sailors. But Ferdinand had already commenced hostilities before these treaties were signed. He was the more ready to listen to the representations of Nelson and the English Cabinet, as he was assured by many emigrants that the population of the Roman States was disposed to rise against the French. It was also asserted that the Emperor was preparing to invade Lombardy. The French army amounted to only 16,000 men, badly provided, and scattered over a line of near 200 miles. The Neapolitan army of 40,000 men entered the Roman territories November 24th in three directions. The right wing, commanded by General Micheroux, penetrated through the Abruzzi; Count Roger de Damas, with the left, advanced by way of Terracina; while Mack, with the centre, marched straight upon Rome by Frosinone. Championnet, the French commander, after providing for the defence of the castle of St. Angelo, and causing the rest of Rome to be evacuated, retreated with the few French and Polish troops he could collect towards the north, and took post at Rieti, Terni, and Cività Castellana. Meanwhile Mack advanced to Rome, followed by King Ferdinand, who entered that capital November 29th, amid the acclamations of the people. A counter-revolution now took place. All the monuments of French domination were destroyed and its partisans rigorously punished. At the same time, by order of Nelson, some English and Portuguese men of war, having on board 6000 Neapolitan troops, proceeded to Leghorn, and were admitted by the officers of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. Their mission was to incite an insurrection in Tuscany, and to intercept the communications of the French army with the North of Italy. These events, and the prospect of a new Coalition,

[47] Martens, t. vi. p. 524. [48] *Ibid.* p. 528.

induced the French to expel the King of Sardinia from his dominions —a catastrophe which they had long prepared. Joubert, under the mask of friendship for the Piedmontese, seized by a stratagem the citadels of Novara and Alessandria, and the post of Arona; marched upon Turin and compelled Charles Emanuel IV. to sign an act of abdication, December 9th 1798. The unfortunate King retired to Sardinia; and the Directory established a provisional government in Piedmont, which was treated as a French province.

Ferdinand's rapid success was followed by as sudden a reverse. Mack's advance had hitherto been skilfully conducted; but he lost several days at Rome, a fault which seems attributable to the King, who wished to enjoy his triumph. Mack, however, committed several blunders in his further advance, and at Nepi he was defeated with terrible loss by a French corps of only 5000 men, commanded by Macdonald (December 5th). Other defeats followed, in which large bodies of Neapolitans were captured or dispersed by mere handfuls of French. Meanwhile not a single Austrian soldier had appeared, and on December 11th Mack commenced a retreat. Ferdinand fled to Caserta, and the French again entered Rome, December 15th. They were now in turn to become the invaders. Their columns advanced with rapid march upon Naples, and Ferdinand, his Queen, and all the royal family embarked, with a large sum of money and their most valuable effects, December 24th, on board Nelson's ship, the Vanguard, who conveyed them to Palermo, taking with him what Neapolitan ships were ready for sea, and burning the remainder. The French nowhere experienced resistance from the regular Neapolitan forces except at Capua, where Championnet, with only 8000 or 9000 men, had placed himself in a very critical situation. But his good fortune, and the stupidity and cowardice of his opponents, came to his aid; and on January 10th 1799 that city capitulated. The peasants of the country and the *Lazzaroni* of Naples were much more troublesome to the French than the regular troops. Enraged at what they considered the treachery of Mack and of Prince Pignatelli, whom Ferdinand at his departure had appointed vicar-general of the kingdom, the *Lazzaroni*, when they heard of the armistice of Capua, rose *en masse*, seized the castles of Naples, liberated all the prisoners, compelled Mack and Pignatelli to fly for their lives, and pronounced sentence of death against all persons suspected of Jacobinism. During two or three days they maintained against the French a desperate and bloody resistance in the suburbs and town of Naples. But this fickle crowd, gained by the promises and bribes of Championnet, and the veneration which he displayed for their saint Januarius, began to

shout as lustily for a Republic as they had before shouted for the King: the castles were delivered up to the French army, and tranquillity was restored. The blood of St. Januarius, which had refused to liquefy at the departure of the King, performed that miracle in favour of Championnet; but not before Prince Moliterno, one of the leaders of the French party at Naples, had threatened to assassinate the archbishop if it was not accomplished. The French conquest being thus sanctioned by the approbation of the patron saint, Naples was the same day declared free and independent, and a provisional republican government was established. Such was the foundation of the PARTHENOPEAN REPUBLIC;[49] a euphemism for the military despotism of the French general.

The Neapolitan war was but the prelude to a much more extensive one which involved the greater part of Europe. The overbearing insolence, the insatiable rapacity, of the French Pentarchs were insufferable. These men, who pretended to spread liberty abroad, had established the most absolute despotism at home. The elections of May 1798 having been unfavourable to them—though it was not now the royalists but the republicans who prevailed—they annulled the greater part of the returns by virtue of a power conferred upon them by the legislative councils. No liberty of opinion was tolerated. The action of the former revolutionary tribunals was supplied by military commissions. Persons accused or suspected by the Government of political offences, that is, of attempts against their power, were shot in the Champ de Mars or the plain of Grenelle. Yet the Directors and the deputies who were subservient to them still pretended to be the delegates of the people; affected more than ever the appearance of a democratic equality; ostentatiously enjoined by placards in all public places the employment of the title of *citizen*. Barras and Rewbel were predominant at the Luxembourg. Barras, enriched by corruption and the spoils of conquered provinces, led a dissolute life; his residence was the resort of all the gamesters and *femmes galantes* of Paris. Rewbel was perhaps the boldest and most violent of the Pentarchs, but his views were narrow and confined. La Réveillère-Lepeaux was lost in his dreams of *theophilanthropy*, while Merlin and Treilhard were mere advocates converted into politicians and statesmen.

Such was the government which aimed at subjugating Europe under pretence of giving it freedom. Their whole legislative

[49] The Neapolitan war and its consequences are amply detailed in the *Mém. d'un homme d'état*, t. vi., p. 401—480; and t. vii. p. 16—64, 132—198: Cf. Botta, lib. xvi.: Colletta, *Storia di Napoli*.

science consisted in translating into different languages the French Constitution of the year III, imposing it, like a regimental coat cut upon one pattern, upon all nations indiscriminately, and exacting, in return for this inestimable blessing, their obedience and their treasures. On this principle had been established, during the sitting of the Congress at Rastadt, in addition to the Cisalpine and Ligurian Republics, those of Rome, Helvetia, and Parthenope; while the Dutch had been compelled to approximate their form of government nearer to that of France, under the title of the "One and Indivisible Batavian Republic" (May 1st 1798). The domineering conduct of the French at Rastadt we have already described. They kept continually increasing their pretensions. After the demand for the demolition of Ehrenbreitstein, they advanced fresh ones respecting the *Thalweg*, or path of navigation along the Rhine; claimed that the Waal should be included and the Isle of Buderich, opposite Wesel, a Prussian possession. But it would be superfluous to detail the disputes of this Congress, which served Austria and France only as a long truce, and was probably even from the first intended as little more. The battle of Aboukir, the absence of Bonaparte, the news of the alliance between Russia and Austria, and the advance of the Russian troops, had, however, inspired the Directory with alarm. They now began to moderate their pretensions at Rastadt. They made advances to the Emperor, and offered, if he would consent to the retirement of the Russian troops, to withdraw their forces from Switzerland and Rome, to neutralise those States, and, on the conclusion of the peace of the Empire at Rastadt, to place the Papal Legations in the hands of Austria by way of guarantee. They also offered to negociate with England and the Porte, in order to a general pacification. But at the same time they prepared for war. The Councils had voted a levy of 200,000 men, a grant of 90 million francs for the service of the army and 35 millions for the navy. The raising of these men by conscription occasioned a serious insurrection in the Netherlands for the conquered provinces were also compelled to swell with their contingents the ranks of the French armies.

Austria, however, stimulated by Great Britain and Russia, had resolved upon war. The British Ministry, despairing of peace with a Government like the French, had used every exertion to form the new Coalition. The Directory, on their side, paraded their implacable hatred of England, by ordering all public officers to inscribe, in large red characters, in the most conspicuous part of their audience chambers, *Guerre au gouvernement Anglais*.[50]

[50] Montgaillard, t. v. p. 113.

For the present, however, Austria dissembled, awaiting the arrival of the Russians, who marched but slowly. She wished to avoid entering upon a war before the termination of the winter, when the snows of the Alps would interrupt all communication between her armies in Italy and Germany. Hence she had disapproved of the Neapolitan war as premature, and had given Ferdinand no assistance. The negociations at Rastadt were continued, though they had become a mere matter of form, while troops were marching in every direction. France also was inclined to wait for the spring before commencing hostilities. She had, however, obtained possession of Ehrenbreitstein, by the capitulation of January 23rd 1799. At length the Directory demanded a categorical answer from Austria respecting the advance of the Russian troops, and, receiving no reply, they gave the word to their armies to advance (February 20th).

Preparations had been made for a campaign on a grand scale. Jourdan, with 46,000 men, called prematurely the army of the Danube, was to act in Suabia and Bavaria. His rear and left flank were secured by an army of observation on the Rhine, consisting of 48,000 men under Bernadotte. The army of Helvetia, 30,000 men under Masséna, acting in conjunction with Jourdan, but subordinately to him, was to penetrate into the Tyrol; where a detached corps of the army of Italy, having proceeded through the Engadine, was to form a junction with it. For this purpose, however, it would be necessary for Masséna to drive the Austrians from the territory of the Grison League. The French had attempted to possess themselves of that country, after their occupation of Switzerland; but their invasion and pillage of Switzerland, as well as the confiscation of the Valteline and Chiavenna, had naturally rendered the Grisons averse to any connection with France, and had induced them to seek in preference the aid of the Court of Vienna. By the convention of Coire, October 7th 1798, the Austrian troops had been admitted, and Hotze, with 24,000 men, protected the Vorarlberg and the Grison territory.

The army of Italy, under Schérer, consisting of 50,000 men, without including Italian contingents, though not subordinate to Jourdan, was to co-operate in the general plan of attack. Schérer was to drive back the Austrians, who had assembled on the Adige, to the Brenta and the Piave; to act by his left upon Trent. A division of the army of Italy was to invade Tuscany, while another, as already mentioned, was to form a junction with the army of Helvetia through the Engadine. The Austrian army destined to oppose Schérer in Italy consisted of 75,000 men. The command

of it had been given to Frederick, Prince of Orange; but that young prince, who had already displayed great military abilities, having died suddenly (January 6th 1799), General Melas was appointed to succeed him. On the arrival, however, of the Russians in Italy, the command-in-chief was to be assumed by Suvaroff. Besides the army on the Adige, between 40,000 and 50,000 men, under Count Bellegarde, occupied South Tyrol and the valley of the Inn. In Germany, the advance of Jourdan was to be opposed by the Archduke Charles, who, agreeably to the convention with France, was posted behind the Lech, in Bavaria, with 54,000 foot and 24,000 horse. The campaign of 1799 was, therefore, to be a sort of repetition of that of 1796—an attack upon Austria through Northern Italy and Southern Germany. But the position of the French was now much more advantageous than in 1796, although their forces were numerically inferior to the Austrians. Instead of having to conquer Northern Italy, that country was now in their power as far as the Adige; Switzerland, instead of being neutral, was occupied by their troops, and seemed to afford them new facilities for assailing their enemy. But the genius of Bonaparte was wanting to make a proper use of these advantages.

We can give only a general idea of the campaign of 1799.[51] The Directory declared war against the Emperor, and, at the same time, against the Grand Duke of Tuscany, March 12th. All that could be alleged against the latter was some preparations for defence. Jourdan, crossing the Rhine at Hüningen and Strasburg, advanced through the Black Forest towards the Danube. At the same time a division of the army of observation, commanded by Ney, seized Mannheim. Masséna was the first to commence actual hostilities (March 5th). He defeated the Austrians in the Grison territory, occupied Coire, and penetrated to the frontiers of the Tyrol; but Jellalich, at Feldkirch, in the Vorarlberg, resisted all his efforts. The Archduke Charles advanced to meet Jourdan, defeated him at Ostrach, March 21st, and again so decisively at Stockach, on the 25th, as to determine the fortune of the campaign, and compel the French to recross the Rhine. This victory was due to the coolness, sagacity, and personal courage of the Archduke, who charged on foot at the head of his grenadiers. The resistance of Jellalich at Feldkirch prevented Masséna from coming to Jourdan's aid by way of Bregenz and Lindau. Meanwhile, on the other side of the Alps, Lecourbe and Dessolles,

[51] The principal source for it is the Archduke Charles's work: *Gesch. des Feldzugs von* 1799 *in Deutschland und in der Schweitz*: cf. Clausewitz, *Die Feldzüge von* 1799; Dumas, *Précis des événements mil. de* 1799—1814.

advancing by the Engadine, defeated Loudon at Taufers, occupied Martinsbrück and the Münsterthal, thus commanding the valleys of the Tyrol. But the retreat of Jourdan rendered these dear-bought successes unavailing; and before the end of March the French were driven back in this quarter by Bellegarde. The occupation of Switzerland proved, under these circumstances, more detrimental to the French than its neutrality would have been, by compelling them to keep troops there which might otherwise have reinforced their beaten armies. The Aulic Council at Vienna did them however some service by forbidding the Archduke to pursue his victorious career.

The advance of the Austrians had compromised the safety of the French plenipotentiaries at Rastadt. Count Metternich, the Imperial minister, had announced his recall April 7th, as well as the resolution of the Emperor to annul all that had been done at Rastadt. The Congress was thus *de facto* terminated, as the deputation of the Empire could not deliberate in the absence of a representative of the Emperor. Nevertheless, the French minister remained, and proceeded to treat separately with the sub-delegates of some of the states of the Empire. A guarantee of the neutrality of Rastadt, which the latter endeavoured to obtain from the commander of the Austrian advanced posts at Gernsbach, was refused; on the evening of April 28th the town was occupied by a detachment of Szekler hussars, whose colonel having directed the French ministers to leave it within twenty-four hours, Bonnier, a man of violent temper, persuaded his colleagues to depart at once, though it was already night. Their carriages had scarcely cleared the town when they were surrounded by a party of Szeklers; Bonnier and Roberjot were sabred; Jean Debry, severely wounded and left for dead, contrived to get back to Rastadt. Nothing was taken from the French ministers but their portfolios. This atrocious violation of the law of nations created universal indignation and abhorrence in Europe. Various were the conjectures as to the authors of the deed. Pitt, the Queen of Naples, the French Directory, Debry himself, the Austrian Government, were in turn suspected according to the views and politics of those who discussed the matter. There could however be little doubt, on a cool and dispassionate survey, that the order for the crime must have emanated from the Cabinet of Vienna, and the presumption was strengthened by the sudden suppression by that cabinet of the judicial inquiry which had been instituted. If we may trust the account given by a diplomatist (the Count de * * *) to M. le Comte de Garden, and published by the latter in his

Histoire des Traités de Paix,[52] all doubts upon the subject are now cleared up. At the time of the occurrence the Count de *** occupied a room in the hotel of the *Golden Stag* at Munich, separated only by thin folding doors from another apartment in which were the Austrian minister, Count Lehrbach, and his secretary. From the conversation of these gentlemen, which was distinctly audible, Count *** learnt that Lehrbach, having received directions from Baron Thugut to discover what members of the German Confederation were in correspondence with the French Directory, imagined the method of arresting their ministers at Rastadt, and extorted the reluctant consent of the Archduke Charles, by showing the peremptory order of Thugut. Lehrbach, it is said, had only directed the colonel of the hussars to give the insolent Bonnier a bit of a shaking (de faire houspiller un peu par ses gens cet insolent Bonnier); but the men overstepped their orders.

Meanwhile, in Italy, Schérer had detached Gauthier against Tuscany, who overran that country without resistance, entered Florence March 25th, and permitted the Grand Duke to retire with an escort to Venice. Schérer determined to attack the Austrians on the Adige before Suvaroff and the Russians could arrive. Melas being sick, the Austrians were now commanded by Marshal Kray. On March 26th and following days Schérer delivered several attacks against Kray's centre at Verona; but, though Moreau had succeeded in turning the Austrian right, the French were finally repulsed with great loss, and compelled to fall back on Villa Franca (April 1st). After much manœuvring, both sides determined on an engagement; and on the 5th of April was fought the battle of MAGNANO, in which the French, after a hard and dubious struggle, were completely defeated. Schérer retreated by Roverbella over the Mincio, followed by Kray. On the 8th of April the French were attacked in all their posts from Bornio to the Lago di Garda, and compelled to retire to Brescia. It is computed that in less than a fortnight's hostilities Schérer had lost nearly half his army.

Such was the state of things in Italy when Suvaroff arrived at Verona to take the command of both the Imperial armies (April 14th). His commission from the Czar gave him the supreme direction of the Russian forces by sea as well as land. Thus,

[52] Tom. vi. p. 98 sqq. Cf. Hormayr, *Lebensbilder*, Th. i. S. 156 f. Th. iii. S. 130 ff. ap. Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18en. Jahrh.* B. vi. S. 182. According to the latter, Thugut and Lehrbach wished to seize some papers that would have compromised them.

after the taking of Corfû by Admiral Utschakoff, he directed the Russian fleet to attack Ancona. What plan he had formed for the campaign was utterly unknown; in fact, he seems seldom to have had any. The grand secret of his success was the celerity of his movements, and the coolness and sagacity with which he extricated himself from any difficult position into which they might have thrown him. Inspiring the Austrians with his own activity, Suvaroff advanced from one victory to another. The Oglio is passed. Moreau, by whom Schérer had now been superseded, is defeated at Cassano on the Adda (April 27th); Milan is entered on the 29th, which Moreau evacuates, with the exception of the citadel; General Serrurier, with a division of 8000 men, surrounded by superior forces at Verderio, had been compelled to lay down his arms. Moreau, intrusted with the difficult task of rescuing a defeated army, pursued by superior forces, cut off from the army of Naples under Macdonald, and in the midst of an insurgent population, displayed the greatest ability. Proceeding to Turin in person, he put that town in a posture of defence, established his communications with Switzerland and France, and on the 7th of May took up his quarters at Alessandria. His only hope was to arrest the advance of the enemy till Macdonald should come up, when the Aulic Council, as it had done in Germany, stepped in to his aid. Suvaroff had determined to crush Moreau with his whole force, and then to turn upon Macdonald; but the Aulic Council, intent upon securing the conquests already made, weakened Suvaroff by ordering him to lay siege to Mantua, Peschiera, Pizzighetone, and other places, to secure the defiles of the Alps and the Apennines, and, in addition to all this, to attack Moreau. Too weak to accomplish this last order, Suvaroff endeavoured to manœuvre Moreau out of a strong position he had taken near Tortona; but the French general, after delivering some successful attacks, effected his retreat to Coni, or Cuneo (May 19th), obtaining at once a strong position and securing his communications both with Genoa and France.

Meanwhile Macdonald had begun his march from Caserta, May 9th. On the 24th he arrived at Florence, and having united his forces with those of Gauthier, proceeded to put himself in communication with Victor, whom Moreau had despatched to Pontremoli to meet him; and having defeated Klenau's corps, established his communications with Genoa. Moreau himself entered Genoa June 6th; but Macdonald, desirous of plucking some independent laurels, instead of marching to that city, took a more northerly route towards the main body of the Austro-

Russians, and, having defeated Hohenzollern's corps June 12th, advanced to the Trebbia. Here, after a struggle of three days' duration, he received from Suvaroff in person one of the most disastrous overthrows that the French republican armies had yet experienced (June 19th), and, after a loss of 18,000 men, was compelled to retreat to Firenzuola. Hence, pretending to retire with the remainder of his forces into Tuscany, he gained the Genoese States by a circuitous route.

Moreau, who had beaten Bellegarde at San Giuliano, June 20th, revictualled Tortona, and raised the blockade of Alessandria, was induced, by the news of the battle on the Trebbia, to retire beyond the Bochetta to Novi. The Austro-Russians had taken possession of Turin; Suvaroff had caused Pignerol, Susa, La Brunetta, and the Col d'Assiette to be occupied, and some of his Cossacks had even carried alarm into Dauphiné. These manœuvres were intended to draw Moreau from the Apennines, but the French general was not to be so enticed.

At this juncture Moreau was superseded in the command by Joubert, through intrigues in the Directory. A sort of revolution had taken place in that body in the preceding May. Rewbel having gone out by rotation, Sieyès had occupied his seat, and, in conjunction with Barras, and with the aid of the Councils, had compelled Treilhard, Merlin de Douai, and La Réveillère-Lepaux to resign. Their places were filled by Gohier, Ducos, and General Moulins, men but little known and of no weight or importance. A change was also effected in the Ministry. Bernadotte became Minister of War; Robert Lindet, one of the original Jacobins and long a member of the Committee of Public Welfare, was intrusted with the Finances; Reinhardt superseded Talleyrand in the ministry of Foreign Affairs; Cambacérès, an ex-Conventional, and formerly member of the Committee of General Welfare, received the portfolio of Justice; Fouché, the sanguinary Jacobin, notorious by his cruelties at Lyon, was placed at the head of the Police. Joubert, if victorious, was to return and overthrow the Directory, and to place himself at the head of a new Government.[53]

Moreau had been directed to remain inactive till Joubert's arrival, which, owing to various delays, did not take place till early in August. With rash impetuosity, Joubert gave battle to the Austro-Russians under Suvaroff, at Novi, August 15th, with only about half the forces of his opponents, and was killed at the very commencement of the action. Moreau then resumed the

[53] *Homme d'état*, t. vii p. 263.

command. In this obstinate engagement, which lasted the whole day, the French were totally defeated, with great loss. Tortona surrendered in consequence to the Austro-Russians, August 23rd.

Soon after this battle, Suvaroff received orders from his Government to proceed into Switzerland, to act in conjunction with another Russian army which had been despatched thither under Korsakoff. Suvaroff had now become disgusted with his Austrian allies, whose slow and pedantic method impeded his own impetuous tactics. He had, too, been disappointed in a scheme to invade France, overturn the Government, and restore the Bourbons. With this view he had pressed the Archduke Charles to drive Masséna from Switzerland, and enter Franche Comté, while he himself would meet him by way of Provence and Dauphiné. But the Austrians were not inclined for any such hazardous undertakings. The Archduke, indeed, had, by orders from his Government, been kept in a state of almost entire inaction during the last two or three months. He had entered Switzerland towards the end of May, and, after several warm affairs with Masséna for the possession of Zürich, had compelled the French general to retire to a strong position on the plateau of Mont Albis, extending along the Reuss to the Lake of Zug. Here the two armies remained watching each other, and no hostilities of any moment occurred. Matters were in this state when, about the middle of August, Korsakoff, with a Russian army of 40,000 men, entered Switzerland. This was the corps that was to have been placed at the disposal of Prussia, but which was now employed as described by virtue of a convention between Great Britain and Russia, June 29th 1799. On Korsakoff's arrival, the Archduke abandoned to him the command, and leaving an Austrian division of 30,000 men to co-operate with the Russians, marched with the remainder of his forces against the newly-organised French army of the Rhine, which, under the command of General Müller, had occupied Heidelberg and Mannheim. At the Archduke's approach, the French raised the siege of Philippsburg, the only fortress on the Rhine still held by the Germans. Charles retook Mannheim September 18th; but the events which had occurred in Switzerland prevented him from prosecuting his advantages.

The ill-feeling that prevailed between the allied armies was manifested by Korsakoff's instructions, who was directed not to attend to any Austrian orders, but to receive only those of Suvaroff. Korsakoff, who had no experience except on the parade-ground, united with an utter want of military talent the most insufferable arrogance and self-conceit. He treated with insolence

and contempt the counsels of a commander like the Archduke, who, by three months' experience, had acquired an accurate knowledge of the ground and of the designs of the enemy. Such a man became an easy prey to generals like Masséna and Soult. Aware of the approach of Suvaroff, Masséna resolved to attack Korsakoff before he could be reinforced. Passing the Limmat at Dietikon before break of day, September 25th, the French utterly routed and dispersed the Russians, and occupied the road leading from Zürich to Winterthür, in order to cut off their retreat. On the same day another French corps under Soult attacked the Austrian division under Hotze. This general was killed in an ambuscade; Petrasch, who succeeded him in the command, was totally defeated and compelled to retreat by Lichtenstez to St. Gall. On the 26th the French entered Zürich, where a large part of the Russians had taken refuge in a state of helpless disorder. A terrible massacre ensued, which was not confined to the Russians. It was on this occasion that the celebrated physiognomist Lavater was shot in cold blood by a French officer who had a little before partaken of his hospitalities. Korsakoff, after losing the greater part of his army and 100 guns, succeeded in passing the Rhine at Schaffhausen with the remainder of his forces.

The approach of Suvaroff, by diverting the attention of the French, facilitated the escape of Korsakoff. With the remnant of his army, variously estimated at from 13,000 to 24,000 men, Suvaroff, advancing by Airolo, succeeded, by prodigious perseverance and valour, in scaling the St. Gothard, then unprovided with any tolerable roads, and in scattering the French columns opposed to his passage. Pursuing his march along the valley of the Reuss, by Altdorf, he crossed the Kinzig Culm into the valley of Muotta, or Mütten, where he found himself almost surrounded by the French. Having learnt the disaster that had overtaken Korsakoff, and being defeated in an attempt to cut his way through Masséna's forces, he determined, for the first time in his life, to retreat (September 29th). Crossing the Pragel Pass into Glarus, he there gave his troops a few days' rest, and finally effected his escape into the Grison territory by the Pass of Panix. Hence by way of Feldkirch, with the remnants of the two armies, he directed his homeward march to Russia.

On July 26th Paul I. had declared war against Spain, because, abandoning the true road of honour and glory, she refused to renounce her alliance with France. Charles IV., or rather the Prince of the Peace, in a manifest published at St. Ildefonso, September 9th 1799, characterised the Russian declaration as

"incoherent and offensive," dictated by English influence, and unworthy of an answer.[54] Little could result from a breach between two countries possessing so few points of contact as Russia and Spain. Its most important consequence was a treaty of defensive alliance between Portugal and Russia, signed at St. Petersburg September 18th 1799;[55] by which the furnishing of the military and naval forces stipulated might be commuted for a money payment.

We shall here, in order to advert to some other events of this period, leave for a while the memorable Austro-Russian campaign of 1799, at a point where fortune seemed in some degree to have re-established the equilibrium of the contending Powers; recording only the renewal of the war on the part of the German Empire, by a decree of the Diet of Ratisbon, September 16th, to which, however, Prussia, as well as Saxony, Hesse-Cassel, Hanover, and Brunswick, did not adhere.[56]

The combined Ottoman and Russian fleets under Admiral Utschakoff, after taking Cerigo, Zante, Cephalonia, Sta. Maura, and, finally, Corfû, March 1st 1799, appeared in the middle of April before Otranto, captured that town, as well as Brindisi and Bari, and landed forces that reduced all Apulia. Another Russo-Turkish division took Sinigaglia and Fano, and in June laid siege to Ancona. These events, as well as the turn of the campaign in Northern Italy, and the departure of Macdonald and his army, occasioned a royalist insurrection in the Neapolitan dominions. Cardinal Ruffo, who had accompanied King Ferdinand and his court to Palermo, having landed with only two other persons at Reggio in Calabria, and having collected a small force of some 200 or 300 men, began his march for Naples, receiving every day fresh accessions which at length swelled his army to between 20,000 and 30,000 men. This force, composed of the half-savage peasants of Calabria, besides brigands and liberated galley-slaves, was dignified with the name of the "Christian Army." Naples was reached and taken, June 17th, scenes of vengeance and massacre ensued, to put an end to which Ruffo granted the revolutionists a favourable capitulation. The French garrison in the castle of St. Elmo surrendered July 5th, and on the 27th King Ferdinand IV. re-entered his capital. Every lover of his country, every admirer of her greatest naval hero, must lament that Nelson, who was absent from Naples at the time of the capitulation, should have disavowed it on his return, though signed by one of his own captains; that he

[54] Garden, t. vi. p. 183. [55] Martens, t. vi. p. 696.
[56] Menzel, B. vi. S. 387.

should have persuaded King Ferdinand to repudiate it and to condemn to death a great many of the revolutionists, including Prince Moliterno, Marquis Caraccioli, and the Duke of Cassano; nay, that he should have converted the quarter-deck of his own vessel into a place of execution. A fatal syren had corrupted for a while the heart of the victor of Aboukir, and, in the intoxication of unlawful love, had caused him to forget the dictates of humanity and his own glory.

The throne of Ferdinand IV. having been thus re-established, a motley army, composed of Russians, Turks, and Neapolitans, marched to Rome and entered that city by capitulation, September 30th. The oppressors of the Pope were discomfited by schismatics and infidels, and the capital of the Christian world, that "Red Apple" which their sultans had so often threatened to destroy, was liberated by the aid of the Osmanlis. The Cisalpine Republic, through the Austro-Russian victories, had also submitted to Francis II.

The Anglo-Russian expedition to Holland was another episode in the great war of 1799. By a convention signed at St. Petersburg, June 22nd,[57] Paul had agreed to assist the English descent with a small fleet and an army of between 17,000 and 18,000 men, in consideration of their expenses being paid. General Sir Ralph Abercrombie, with about 12,000 men, the first division of the British forces, landed in North Holland, August 27th, defeated the Dutch under General Daendels, and occupied the Helder. The English general announced that he was come to liberate the Dutch from the French yoke. Proclamations were also published by the Prince of Orange and his son, recalling his ancient subjects to their allegiance; but such was the fear inspired by the French, that, except in the Dutch navy, which dreaded not the effects of their anger, these appeals produced little or no effect. The English fleet under Admiral Mitchell having entered the Vlie, the crews of the Dutch squadron there hoisted the Orange colours, arrested their officers, and went over to the English. The example was followed by the squadron at Nieu Diep. Altogether, twelve ships of war, fully equipped, and thirteen other vessels, fell into the power of the English, and were sent to Yarmouth. Abercrombie, awaiting reinforcements from England and Russia, having taken up a position behind the Zijp, was attacked by the French and Dutch under General Brune; but they were defeated and driven back to Alkmaar (September 10th). A few days after the Duke of York

[57] Martens, t. vi. p. 561.

landed with the second English division, and took the command-in-chief. Part of the Russian forces having also arrived, the Duke attacked Brune at Petten, September 19th; but the right wing, composed of Russians, having advanced too far, were repulsed with great loss. Their flight threw the whole army into confusion, and the affair resulted in a drawn battle. The Duke of York defeated Brune at Bergen, October 2nd, but knew not how to follow up his advantage. The allies having been defeated at Kastrikum, October 6th, the Duke of York again retired beyond the Zijp, and entered into negociations with Brune for the evacuation of Holland. A capitulation was consequently signed at Alkmaar, October 18th, by which it was agreed that the allies should re-embark without molestation before the end of November, on condition of their restoring 8000 French and Batavian prisoners. The frustration of an expedition which had cost so large a sum created great discontent and clamour in England; but the nation was in some degree compensated by the possession of the Dutch fleet, and consoled by the capture of Surinam, which colony had surrendered to the British arms, August 20th.

The reverses of his armies in Switzerland and Holland, and the refusal of the Austrians to deliver to him Ancona, led the Emperor Paul I. to recall his troops and to withdraw from the Coalition as hastily and capriciously as he had entered it. Thus France was rescued from the greatest danger that had menaced it since the Prussian invasion of Champagne. The return of Bonaparte from Egypt, whose unexpected landing at Fréjus created a great sensation in France, and, indeed, throughout Europe, was soon to place her affairs in a better posture.

CHAPTER X.

When by the destruction of Brueys' fleet, Bonaparte found himself cut off from all communication with France, he began to think of establishing himself firmly in Egypt, and of making it the base of those gigantic enterprises which he had meditated against the English empire in the East. He strove to conciliate the inhabitants by respecting their customs, and especially their religion. Like the heathen conquerors of ancient Rome, he was ready to adopt all the gods of all the vanquished nations, except only the God of the Jews and Christians. In an interview with the Mufti in the pyramid of Cheops, he professed himself a believer in the Prophet, adopted the sententious and hyperbolical language of the East. He also attempted to domiciliate his army in a country which they had no prospect of speedily quitting. Cairo was converted into a sort of little Paris, with French newspapers, *restaurants*, literary societies, gaming tables, and other luxuries. The exactions of the French, however, created serious discontent among the natives, and all Bonaparte's vigilance could not prevent the breaking out of a dangerous conspiracy at Cairo, and the massacre of 300 of his men. But it was speedily quelled, and Bonaparte, from motives of policy, treated the ringleaders with clemency.

The enterprising mind of Bonaparte could not long remain in repose, and towards the end of 1798 he began to meditate further conquests. He visited Suez, explored the coasts of the Red Sea, entered into correspondence with Tippoo Sultaun, then at war with the English; little dreaming that a young soldier, Colonel Wellesley, destined at a future period to put a term to his own extraordinary career, was then serving against that prince. The Syrian campaign was, however, finally determined on. Bonaparte appears to have formed the extraordinary scheme of taking Constantinople, attacking Europe in flank, and marching to Paris.[1] He left Cairo, Feb. 11th, 1799, with a few of his bravest generals and about 12,000 of his best troops. The desert was rapidly traversed, El Arisch, Gaza, taken at the first assault, but Jaffa offered some resist-

[1] According to his own communications to Berthier. Mdme de Staël, *Considérations, &c.*, P. iv. ch. i.

ance, which was punished by a promiscuous massacre (March 7th). The garrison, some 4000 Turks, shutting themselves up in a caravanserai, had desperately defended it, and had capitulated only on condition that their lives should be spared. Nevertheless, those who survived, about half the original number, were mercilessly shot. Miot, an eyewitness of their execution, has described how they were marched to the sea-shore, divided into little bands, despatched with musket-balls, and, when these failed, with the bayonet and the sword.[2] The impossibility of keeping so large a number of prisoners has been alleged in extenuation of this barbarous act. Bonaparte, in his correspondence, treats it quite as a matter of course.[3] He was not unnecessarily cruel; he did not shed blood, like some monsters, merely for the pleasure of it; but he had a reckless contempt for human life, and never suffered considerations of humanity to arrest him in the pursuit of his objects.

From Jaffa Bonaparte marched to St. John d'Acre, which he invested March 20th. But here Djezzar Pasha, with 1000 Turks, assisted by Commodore Sir Sidney Smith and some 200 or 300 English sailors and marines, succeeded in arresting his progress. St. John d'Acre was badly fortified, but Bonaparte had only field guns to employ against it; his siege artillery, which he had forwarded by sea, had been captured by Sir Sidney Smith's cruisers. Kléber defeated at Mount Thabor, April 16th, a large but irregular Turkish army that was marching to relieve Acre. But, as it could be victualled from the sea, it sufficed for its own defence. After a siege of sixty days, during which nine desperate assaults had been delivered, and many sorties made by the garrison, Bonaparte, after losing a third of his army, was compelled to retire from before this apparently contemptible place. He displayed the malignity inspired by his defeat by destroying the aqueduct and several of the public buildings. Yet he pretended in his despatches that he had been successful, that he had retired only for fear of the plague. So portentous were the falsehoods which he dictated

[2] Miot, *Mém. pour servir à l'hist. des expéditions en Egypte et en Syrie*, p. 144 sqq. (ed. 1814.)

[3] See his letters to Dugua, Marmont and Kléber, *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. v. pp. 351, 353. To the last he says: "La garnison de Jaffa était de près de 4000 hommes; 2000 ont été tués dans la ville, et près de 2000 ont été fusillés entre hier et aujourd'hui." Bonaparte afterwards attempted to palliate the matter by reducing the number of victims to 1000 or 1200, and by affirming that they had formed part of the garrison of El Arisch, and had broken their parole. O'Meara, vol. i. p. 329. The first of these excuses is futile; a few hundred more or less makes no difference as to the morality of the action; *all* that were taken were put to death. The second excuse is an evident after-thought. Nothing of the kind appears in Bonaparte's letters at the time of the occurrence.

that his secretary Bourienne threw down his pen in amazement. That the French army was infected with the plague is, however, true enough. Hundreds of the men were laid up at Jaffa; where Bonaparte, it is said, sought to inspire his followers with confidence by laying his hand on the buboes of the sick: a trait of confidence in his destiny, like Cæsar's, when he commanded the boatman to proceed and fear not.

Bonaparte got back to Cairo June 15th. During his absence Desaix had driven Murad Bey and his Mamelukes from Upper Egypt, had passed Thebes and arrived at Syene and the cataracts of the Nile, the furthest station occupied by the Roman legions. Murad, who eluded the pursuit of the French by the most rapid and unexpected manœuvres, at length submitted, and in reward of the constancy and valour he had displayed, was made Prince of Said or Upper Egypt. At the instance of England, the Porte made an attempt to recover Egypt and landed an army at Aboukir;[4] but Bonaparte, having rapidly collected his forces, defeated them, July 26th, killed or captured a large number and drove the remainder into the sea, where the greater part miserably perished. About a week after this battle, Bonaparte received, through a parlementary of Sir Sidney Smith's, some French and English newspapers, relating the defeats of the Republican armies in Germany and Italy, of which he had not yet heard. His astonishment and rage may be imagined at learning that all his Italian conquests had been lost in less than two months. He immediately resolved to return to France. But it was necessary to depart secretly, and in order to veil his design he went back to Cairo, where he affected to employ himself in giving orders for a scientific expedition to the Thebais. Then suddenly returning to Alexandria, and transferring by a letter the command of the army to Kléber, he embarked on board a French frigate at Aboukir, August 22nd, accompanied by Berthier, Lannes, Murat, Andréossy and Marmont, generals devotedly attached to his fortunes, and after a passage of nearly seven weeks, during which he contrived to escape the English cruisers by hugging the African coast, he landed at Fréjus, Oct. 9th.[5]

Bonaparte was received with enthusiasm. The French were now quite disgusted with their Government; the complaints which he heard against it during his journey to Paris were loud and general. The finances, as well as every other branch of the ad-

[4] The number of it has sometimes been exaggerated to 20,000; but the real force seems not to have exceeded 7000. *Homme d'état*, t. vii. p. 352.

[5] Bonaparte's own account of the voyage will be found in *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. v. end.

ministration, were in disorder. The nation was disgusted with the military reverses in Italy and Germany. The troops themselves were neither paid nor clothed, nay, hardly fed. A schism prevailed in the Directory. Sieyès, ever busy with new political schemes, had resolved to overthrow the Constitution of the year III, and to concentrate the dissipated forces of the Government in the hands of some powerful individual; and we have already related how Joubert had been selected for that purpose. After his death Sieyès had turned his eyes on Moreau and Bernadotte, as the only two generals qualified to carry his scheme into execution; but Moreau, who had not much political energy or talent, declined to be concerned in the matter, while the frank and loyal, but haughty temper of Bernadotte appeared to Sieyès unsuited to his purpose. The views of Sieyès were supported by Roger Ducos. Of the other Pentarchs Barras, enervated by debauchery and engrossed by the pursuit of pleasure, had become almost politically null. He had entered into negociations with Louis XVIII., but soon discovered that a restoration of the Bourbons was at this time impracticable. Gohier and Moulins, the remaining two Directors, were Jacobins. That party, however, no longer entertained their former extreme and violent opinions. They were supported by the majority of the Council of Five Hundred; and out of doors by the *Club du Manège*, so called from its occupying the building in which the Constituent Assembly had formerly sitten. Generals Bernadotte and Jourdan were also Jacobins. Sieyès, however, effected the dismissal of Bernadotte from the ministry at war; and in conjunction with Fouché, now head of the police, caused the *Manège* to be closed.

Bonaparte had returned to France without any settled plan, except a determination to take a leading part. His Italian campaign, his important negociations, as well as the romantic glory of his almost fabulous expedition to Egypt, had placed his reputation far above that of any other general. The little part which he had taken in the domestic affairs of France, and consequent freedom from all party ties, was also in his favour. He seemed already to have assumed an air of superiority and command. Sieyès was at first justly distrustful of him, as too ambitious to acquiesce in his Constitutional plans. Mutual friends, however, brought about an understanding, and the plot of a revolution was laid. Sieyès undertook to prepare the Councils for it, while Bonaparte was to gain the soldiery. On the morning of the 18th *Brumaire* (Nov. 9th), the Ancients were summoned to the Tuileries at the early hour of seven, when certain members alarmed them with reports of

a Jacobin plot, of the revival of the Reign of Terror. When they were sufficiently frightened, Regnier, another conspirator, moved that the legislature should be transferred to St. Cloud, under the conduct of Bonaparte, who had been appointed to command the troops. Meanwhile Bonaparte had assembled the greater part of the generals at his house in the Rue Chantereine. Most of them—Berthier, Lefèbvre, Murat, Moncey, Moreau, Macdonald, Serrurier, Beurnonville, Marmont and others—drew their swords and promised to stand by him. Bernadotte alone ventured to express his disapprobation. Bonaparte now proceeded at the head of the generals to the Tuileries, and took an oath of fidelity at the bar of the Council of the Ancients; Sieyès and Ducos arrived from the Luxembourg and tendered their resignation. When Barras, Moulins and Gohier at length heard of what was going on, they attempted to employ their guard; but these soldiers refused to obey when Bonaparte communicated to them the decree of the Ancients. Barras then also resigned, and set off for Gros Bois, his country-seat. An emissary of the Directors having come to propose an accommodation, Bonaparte burst forth into one of his characteristic tirades. "What have they done," he exclaimed, "with that France which I left so brilliant? I left them peace, I find war; I left them victories and find only defeats. What have they done with those 100,000 Frenchmen the companions of my glory?" Then, in a quieter tone, "This state of things cannot last; it would speedily lead to a despotism."

On the following day the Councils proceeded to St. Cloud, whither Sieyès and Ducos accompanied Bonaparte. Gohier and Moulins had made their escape from Paris the evening before. When the Five Hundred assembled, Emile Gaudin, who was in the plot, rose and proposed a vote of thanks to the Ancients for what they had done. This was the signal for uproar. A member having proposed to renew the oath to the Constitution of the year III, it was taken with unanimous enthusiasm. Bonaparte in alarm now hastened to the Council of the Ancients, placed himself at their disposal, made an absurd speech, in which he called himself the God of Battles.[6] A deputy having required him to swear to the Constitution of the year III, Bonaparte replied: "That Constitution no longer exists; you have violated it on the 18th *Fructidor*, 22nd *Floréal*, 30th *Prairial*. The Constitution, invoked by every faction, and violated by all, is no longer respected by anybody. There must be a new settlement and fresh guarantees." The Council intimated its approbation of these views.

[6] Madame de Staël, P. iv. ch. ii.; Bailleul, t. ii. p. 414.

Elated by this success, and imagining that a similar one awaited him in the Five Hundred, Bonaparte proceeded to their chamber, advanced into the middle of it, leaving some grenadiers at the door. He was received with an indescribable clamour. Menaces rose on all sides, with cries of "Outlaw him! Down with the Dictator!" Some deputies rushed upon and collared him. Alarmed and staggered, Bonaparte seemed about to faint, when Beauvais, a man of remarkable strength, took him in his arms and bore him to the door, where he was received by Lefèbvre and his grenadiers.

Bonaparte, who seemed quite to have lost his presence of mind, was carried through this important crisis by his brother Lucien, the President of the Council of Five Hundred. Seeing that the Assembly was about to outlaw his brother, Lucien, throwing off the ridiculous toga worn by the members of the Legislature, rushed to the door, mounted his horse, and riding towards the troops, exclaimed that he, the President, had been threatened with the daggers of the factious, demanded that the Assembly should be dispersed. Bonaparte left the execution of this stroke to Murat; by whose orders a body of grenadiers dispersed the deputies at the point of the bayonet. A Provisional Government was then established. Persons selected for the purpose were nominated by a remnant of the two Councils as a Committee, with the high-sounding title of "Committee of Public Welfare," who, till the dismissed Legislature should be again assembled, appointed that the Government should be conducted by three Consuls, Bonaparte, Sieyès, and Roger Ducos. The Legislature was to be re-assembled Feb. 20th 1800; meanwhile a Committee of twenty-five members of each Council was to draw up a new Constitution. Thus was accomplished, with the perfect acquiescence of the French people, this important revolution. There can be little doubt that, had Bonaparte been so inclined, he might have seized at once upon the supreme power; but either his courage failed him, or he deemed the proper moment not yet arrived. Virtually, however, as Sieyès soon discovered, he was already master. The new Government immediately adopted some just and vigorous measures. The law of hostages was abrogated, which made the innocent responsible for the guilty; forced loans were abolished; priests proscribed since 18th *Fructidor* were permitted to return; some emigrants who had been shipwrecked on the coast and detained in prison four years, were liberated. On the other hand, great severity was displayed towards the ultra-Jacobins. Between thirty and forty of this faction were ordered, by a simple consular

decree, to be transported to Guiana; many others were placed under the *surveillance* of the police. But public opinion revolted against this measure, and the Consuls found themselves compelled to recall it.

Bonaparte suffered the metaphysical Abbé Sieyès to amuse himself with drawing up a Constitution, which, however, he so altered, in all its essential points, that practically it became a mere form. The Commission of Fifty implicitly obeyed his dictates. The "Constitution of the year VIII" was proclaimed Dec. 24th.[7] The following are the chief features of this short-lived Constitution: a *Conservative Senate* (sénat conservateur), of eighty members at least forty years of age, appointed for life and unremovable, whose principal functions were to select, from lists presented by the electoral colleges of the Departments, the Legislators, Tribunes, Consuls, Judges, &c. It was also a Court of Appeal respecting all acts denounced to it by the Tribunate or by the Government as unconstitutional. A *Tribunate* of 100 members twenty-five years of age at least, to discuss, adopt, or reject the laws proposed to it by the Government. A *Legislative Assembly* (corps législatif), composed of 300 members at least thirty years of age. This assembly gave only a silent vote of acceptance or rejection of the *projets de loi* discussed before it by the orators of the Tribunate or of the Government. An *Executive Government* of three Consuls nominated for ten years, and indefinitely re-eligible. Of these, the First Consul was invested with an almost absolute power. The Second and Third Consuls had only a deliberative voice (*voix consultative*) in some of the acts of Government, but even in these the decision of the First Consul sufficed. The salary of the First Consul was 500,000 francs (20,000*l.*); of the remaining two, only three-tenths of that sum. As the members of the Tribunate and Legislature were selected by the Senate from lists of persons called *notables of France*, the result of three degrees of election, by the people, the notables of the *Communes*, and the notables of the Departments; as the Senate itself was chosen by the Consuls, and as the Government alone had the power to initiate laws, the political existence of the nation was completely annihilated; and though the name of a Republic was retained, the new Constitution was virtually a pure despotism.

The first act of Bonaparte on becoming First Consul was to dismiss his two provisional colleagues. Sieyès was rewarded and disgraced with a sum of 800,000 francs, a domain called Crosne,

[7] It will be found in Montgaillard, t. v. p. 305 sqq., and in Posselt's *Europäische Annalen*, Jr. 1799.

and a place in the Senate, the pay of which was 25,000 francs per annum. Roger Ducos was forced to content himself with the humble sum of 120,000 francs. Bonaparte now named as Second Consul Cambacérès, a jurisconsult, ex-conventional and regicide, a man of great legal acquirements; Le Brun, a *littérateur* of polished manners, was appointed Third Consul. He had been secretary to the Chancellor Maupeou, a member of the Constituent Assembly and of the Girondist Government of Roland. Both these men were recommended by their flexibility and their total want of physical and moral courage, as well as by their talents and acquirements. Cambacérès was Bonaparte's interpreter with the Jacobins and revolutionists; Le Brun with the Royalists. Talleyrand was reinstated in the Ministry for Foreign Affairs; Fouché was retained as head of the Police; Gaudin was appointed to the Finances; Berthier was made Chief of the Staff.

Bonaparte, who was surrounded by 3000 of his best troops, took up his residence at the Tuileries even before his nomination as First Consul was constitutionally and officially declared, and the ancient palace of the Bourbons again assumed some appearance of regal splendour and of the rudiments of a court. Bonaparte's motive for this was not mere ostentation; the phantom of royalty gradually prepared the minds of men for the reality. He had resolved to become the mediator between new and old interests, between the Revolution and Europe.[8] The eventual overthrow of the Republic was foreshadowed by the abolition of its two principal fêtes: those of August 10th and Jan. 21st. Encouraged by these aristocratic tendencies, the Royalists ventured to hope that Bonaparte might be induced to act the part of Monk: Louis XVIII. even wrote to suggest his restoration, telling Bonaparte to name his own rewards and those of his friends.[9] But Bonaparte, according to his own phrase, having picked up the crown in the dirt, had determined to wear it, and he soon showed that he was not unworthy of it. He had already learned to govern in Italy and Egypt; under the influence of his great administrative talents order began gradually to reappear in France. Public credit revived; the Bank of France was established; the administration of the Departments was facilitated and brought more under the control of the Government by the institution of prefectures; the Chouan insurrection, which had again broken out, was appeased; but the treacherous manner in which Frotté, and six more of the

[8] Lefèbvre, *Hist. des Cabinets de l'Europe*, Introd.

[9] See the letter in *Homme d'état*, t. vii. p. 393.

Chouan leaders were inveigled and put to death, was another proof of the inhuman and relentless policy of Bonaparte.

With regard to foreign affairs, one of the first steps of Bonaparte was to propose a peace to King George III. and the Emperor Francis II. If he was sincere in these overtures, he hardly adopted, at least with England, the best method to obtain his end. His letter to George III. in person was not only a gross breach of diplomatic etiquette, but also displayed great ignorance or an offensive neglect of the forms of the English Constitution; defects which were not palliated by the trenchant, interrogative, and objurgatory style adopted towards one of the most powerful monarchs of Europe by the Consul of yesterday.[10] On the other hand, Lord Grenville's reply was perhaps too haughty and repulsive. The chief motive with the English Ministry in rejecting this overture appears to have been a want of confidence in the stability of the new French Government. They saw no hope of permanent tranquillity except in the restoration of the Bourbons. The renewal of the correspondence through Talleyrand seems to indicate that Bonaparte might at this time have really desired a peace. His own power needed consolidation; the French army in Italy seemed compromised, that in Egypt irretrievably cut off. The Emperor followed the same course as England, and refused to negociate.

All hope of peace being at an end, Bonaparte prepared for war. The command of the army on the Rhine was given to Moreau, while the First Consul determined to proceed in person into Italy. After the departure of Suvaroff from that country, the French had been defeated with considerable loss at Savigliano, Fossano, and Genola; Coni had surrendered Dec. 5th, completing the occupation of Piedmont by the Austrians; Ancona had also been taken; and thus Genoa and the Riviera were all that remained to the French. In the spring of 1800, the right wing of the French army, consisting of 40,000 men, under Masséna, leaned upon Genoa; its left upon the Var. From many of its posts it had been driven as well by the Austrians as by the fire of the British cruisers. Mélas had succeeded in dividing it, in taking Nice and driving Suchet beyond the Var, while Masséna had been compelled to throw himself into Genoa. Such was the posture of affairs when Bonaparte entered Italy in May 1800. The French army of 60,000 or 70,000 men crossed the Alps in four columns. Bonaparte himself crossed the Great St. Bernard, the natural obstacles of that route having been surmounted with great skill and indomitable perseverance; another column passed Mont

[10] See the letter of Dec. 25th 1799 in *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. vi. p. 36.

Cénis, a third the Simplon, a fourth the St. Gothard. Bonaparte entered Milan June 2nd, and proclaimed the re-establishment of the Cisalpine Republic. Mélas was thus placed between Bonaparte's army and that of Souchet; while the fourth column of the French, under Moncey, had marched upon Brescia, to cut off the retreat of the Austrians into the Venetian States. It became necessary, therefore, for Mélas to fight a battle in order to restore his communications. On the 9th of June Lannes defeated the Austrians under Ott at Montebello, or Casteggio. On the 14th, Mélas, having passed the Bormida opposite Alessandria, gave battle to Bonaparte at MARENGO.[11] The action began at eight o'clock in the morning, and towards the close of the day the Austrians appeared to be victorious. The right wing of the French had been turned; Mélas, secure of victory, had entered Alessandria to refresh himself, when Desaix, arriving with his division, broke the Austrian left, which had extended itself too much, and compelled a body of 5000 Austrian grenadiers, posted in the village of Marengo, to surrender. Desaix, however, was killed in the engagement. The Austrians recrossed the Bormida under cover of the night, and the French remained masters of the field. This battle, which had so nearly proved a defeat for Bonaparte, but which he was accustomed to speak of as one of his most glorious achievements, although tacticians reproach him with having committed several gross mistakes, proved nevertheless decisive. Mélas, an old man of eighty, completely lost his head. Great was the astonishment at the French headquarters on the following day, at receiving from him proposals for an armistice. The Convention of Alessandria, signed June 16th,[12] is one of the most disgraceful capitulations recorded in history. Mélas, on condition of being allowed to retire beyond the Mincio, abandoned the whole of Piedmont and Lombardy, as far as the Oglio; also Genoa. This city had been captured with the aid of the English fleet under Admiral Keith June 4th, and had been revictualled by the English. The Austrian commander therefore had no right to surrender it; had he possessed ordinary resolution, Genoa would have served him as a *point d'appui*, and the English being in possession of the sea, he could always have received provisions and reinforcements. After this short, but brilliant campaign, which had lasted less than six weeks, Bonaparte returned to Paris, leaving Masséna to prosecute the

[11] For an elaborate description of the battle, see De Gross, *Historisch-militärisches Handbuch*. Also the account given by Mélas himself to the Archduke Charles, in Mailath, *Gesch. Oestreichs*, t. v. p. 234–242.

[12] Martens, t. vii. p. 71.

reconquest of Italy, in case the cession of it could not be obtained by negociation.

Meanwhile the campaign upon the Rhine had been opened April 25th. During the following week the French army, under Moreau, passed the Rhine at six different points betweeen Kehl and Dreienhofen. The Austrians were now commanded by Kray. The Archduke Charles having pronounced himself in favour of a peace with France, Thugut and the English party had procured his removal from the army in Germany, under pretence of making him commander-in-chief in Bohemia. Great Britain, after the defection of Paul. I from the Coalition, had entered into treaties with the Electors of Bavaria and Mentz and the Duke of Würtemberg, for supplying about 20,000 men. These had been added to the Austrian army concentrated at Liptingen and Stockach. Bonaparte, in order that Moreau's success might not eclipse his own glory, had wished that general to stand on the defensive; but Moreau was by no means inclined to play so subordinate a part. Hence it is said, as well as from the contempt which he manifested for the plans of the First Consul, arose the aversion which Bonaparte afterwards displayed towards him. Advancing from Basle, Moreau defeated Kray at Engen May 3rd, at Möskirch 5th, at Pfullendorf 6th, while Richepanse repulsed them at Biberach 9th, and Lecourbe at Memmingen 10th. Kray now threw himself into Ulm, which had been newly fortified. But Moreau, having advanced into Bavaria, Kray again took the field, and crossing the Danube marched down the left bank of that river. Moreau despatched Lecourbe against him with 30,000 men, who, crossing the river between Dillingen and Donauwörth, defeated the Austrian rearguard at Hochstädt June 19th. Kray now directed his march towards the Upper Palatinate, thus abandoning Bavaria to the French. Decaen entered Munich June 27th. On the same day Lecourbe defeated Kray at Neuburg, who then took up a position at Ingolstadt. Affairs were in this state when news arrived of the cessation of hostilities in Italy; in consequence of which an armistice was also concluded for Germany, at Parsdorf, July 15th,[13] which arrested the progress of the French towards Austria. The French were to occupy both the Rhenish circles, all Suabia, and great part of Franconia and Bavaria in order, as the Convention expressed it, to place the protection of property and of the established Government in this part of the Empire under the protection of the honour of the French army. Yet the contributions exacted by the French in the occupied territories, reached in August the sum of twenty-four million thalers (3,600,000*l.* sterling)![14]

[13] Martens, t. vii. p. 75. [14] Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. S. 393.

The Emperor Francis II. had at first hesitated to ratify the Convention of Alessandria. Only a few hours before the news of it arrived at Vienna, he had concluded with Great Britain a fresh treaty of subsidies (June 20th 1800[15]) by which, in consideration of an advance of two millions sterling, he agreed to continue the war with all his forces, in conjunction with England. That Power was to put at the disposal of the Emperor the troops which she had hired from the German princes; and both the contracting parties agreed to make no separate peace with the French Republic before Feb. 1st 1801. When the Emperor despatched Count St. Julien to Paris with the ratification of the armistice, that envoy was instructed to sound the First Consul respecting the possibility of a peace in which Great Britain and Naples should be included. St. Julien, though he appears to have had full powers, overstepped his instructions, and signed the preliminaries of an advantageous but separate peace, for which act he was committed to the fortress of Klausenburg, in Transylvania. The Cabinet of Vienna now endeavoured to persuade the First Consul to include Great Britain in the negociations; and the armistice, which had expired in Germany, Sept. 10th, was a second time extended on the 20th for a period of forty-five days by the Convention of Hohenlinden;[16] by which, however, Moreau insisted that Philippsburg, Ulm, and Ingolstadt should be placed in his hands. This interval was employed by several of the minor German princes to make private arrangements with the French generals, for which they had to pay considerable sums.

The hopes of a peace were for the present frustrated. The English Cabinet was not inclined to grant the First Consul's demand for a naval armistice, which would have released the ports of France from blockade, and enabled the French Government to reinforce and revictual their troops in Egypt and Malta. The last-named island, however, surrendered to the English Sept. 5th, after a blockade of nearly two years, which had reduced the French garrison to the last extremity of famine, and diminished its numbers to about 5000 men. On the 12th of November, the French gave the fortnight's notice agreed upon of their renunciation of the armistice, and hostilities were resumed in Germany on the 28th. The Austrian army, now under the command of the Archduke John, crossed the Inn, and, after a trifling success at Ampfing, gave battle to Moreau at HOHENLINDEN, December 3rd. Here Moreau gained one of his most splendid victories. The

[15] Martens, t. vii. p. 61. [16] *Ibid.* p. 84.

Austrians lost 7000 slain, and 11,000 prisoners, and near 100 guns; the most terrible defeat they had sustained in the two wars of the Revolution. They now retired behind the Enns, while the French pushed on to Linz and Salzburg. At the entreaty of Francis II., his brother, the Archduke Charles, now resumed the command, but found the army so diminished and disorganised that he was compelled to propose another armistice, intimating at the same time that the Emperor had resolved upon a peace, whatever might be the views of his allies. Moreau, who was himself in a somewhat critical position, having advanced one hundred leagues beyond his supports, and being liable to an attack in the rear from the Austrians in the Tyrol, deemed it prudent not to reject these offers. An armistice was accordingly concluded at Steyer,[17] December 25th 1800, for an indefinite period, though not less than thirty days, with fifteen days' notice of its expiration.

Meanwhile in Italy the armistice of Alessandria had also been prolonged by that of Castiglione, September 29th.[18] General Brune, by whom Masséna had been superseded in the command of the army of Italy, profited by this interval to occupy Tuscany, which had not been mentioned in the Convention. The armistice expired about the middle of November, but Brune did not commence any active operations till December 25th. The Mincio was passed, then the Adige, January 1st 1801; after which Verona, Vicenza, and Treviso were rapidly occupied. At the same time the French army in the Grisons had entered the Tyrol and occupied Trent, January 7th. But hostilities were suspended by an armistice signed at Treviso, January 16th. By this Convention,[19] Peschiera, Sermione, Verona, Legnago, Ferrara, Ancona, were transferred to the French, and finally also Mantua. This armistice was followed by the PEACE OF LUNÉVILLE, February 9th 1801.[20] Count Cobenzl and Joseph Bonaparte, who, as plenipotentiaries for Austria and France, had met at Lunéville early in the previous November, when it was hoped that England might be included in the negociations, now again proceeded thither to treat for a separate peace. Their conferences were secret, and the ministers of no other Powers were admitted. Francis II. undertook

[17] Martens, t. vii. p. 286. Just about this period, the First Consul had nearly lost his life by a detestable conspiracy. A barrel full of combustibles, called *the infernal machine*, was exploded in the Rue St. Nicaise, now swallowed up in the Place du Carrousel, as Bonaparte was proceeding to the opera on the evening of Dec. 24th. He had passed just in time to escape its effects, but upwards of 50 persons were killed. Two fanatical Chouans were executed for this attempt, which served only to strengthen Bonaparte's power by enabling him to adopt stringent measures of police.

[18] *Ibid.* p. 88.

[19] *Ibid.* p. 291.

[20] *Ibid.* p. 296.

to sign the peace in the name of the Empire as well as his own, a course not entirely without precedent; but the conditions stipulated in the name of the German Confederation were only what their deputation had already agreed to at Rastadt. The Adige was constituted the boundary of the Austrian possessions in Italy. The duchy of Modena was annexed to the Cisalpine Republic, and the Duke of Modena was indemnified with the Breisgau. Tuscany and Elba were ceded to the Infant of Parma; the Grand Duke to obtain an indemnity in Germany; Belgium and the left bank of the Rhine were to remain to the French, and the princes damnified by this cession were to have compensation in Germany. The independence of the Batavian, Helvetian, Cisalpine, and Ligurian republics was guaranteed.

The arrangement concerning Tuscany was the result of a secret treaty between France and Spain, concluded at St. Ildefonso, October 1st 1800. The possession of Tuscany was purchased by Spain for the Infant Louis de Bourbon, duke of Parma, not only by the sacrifice of that duchy, but also of Louisiana, the abandonment of six ships of the line, and the payment of a considerable sum of money.[21] The transaction was finally arranged by the treaty of Madrid between France and Spain, March 21st 1801.[22] The Prince of Parma, who had resided several years at Madrid, and had married one of Charles's daughters, proceeded in the summer to Florence, where he was proclaimed "King of Etruria," August 2nd. The Emperor, by his peace with the French Republic, had abandoned the King of the Two Sicilies to his fate. The Count de Damas, the commander of the Neapolitan army, claimed to be comprehended in the armistice of Treviso, as having acted under the commands of General Bellegarde, but in fact, no stipulation had been made in favour of Naples in that convention. Murat, who commanded a French army that was preparing to invade the Neapolitan dominions, would recognise no such claim, and under the circumstances, Ferdinand IV. deemed it prudent to enter into negociations with the First Consul. An armistice was concluded at Foligno, February 18th 1801, followed by a treaty of peace, signed at Florence, March 28th,[23] by which King Ferdinand engaged to shut his ports against all English and Turkish vessels, whether of war or commerce, till those nations should have concluded a peace with France. By the fourth Article, Ferdinand

[21] Garden, t. vi. p. 265. The treaty of St. Ildefonso is not in Martens' collection, but there is a Spanish version of it in Cantillo, *Tratados de Paz*, p. 692; and a French translation of it in Garden, t. viii. p. 46 sq.

[22] Martens, t. vii. p. 337.

[23] *Ibid.* pp. 343, 345.

renounced his claims to the isle of Elba and the principality of Piombino in Tuscany, forming part of the new kingdom of Etruria. These possessions, which really belonged to the family of Buoncompagni, were not however assigned to the Duke of Parma. They were eventually seized by the French. Elba was annexed to France by a decree of the Senate, August 26th 1802, while the principality of Piombino was erected by Bonaparte into a fief of the French Empire, March 1805, and bestowed on his sister Eliza and her husband, Felix Bacciocchi.[24] There were also secret articles in the Treaty of Florence, by one of which the French were allowed to occupy the peninsula of Otranto, and part of the Abruzzi, with 16,000 men, and Soult entered that peninsula in April with the stipulated force. The object seems to have been to keep this army, at the expense of Naples, in readiness to be transported to Egypt or Greece.

Bonaparte, again supreme in Italy, did not manifest any hostility towards the Pope. The papacy had remained in abeyance after the death of Pius VI. (August 29th 1799) till the election of Cardinal Chiaramonte by a conclave held at Venice, March 14th 1800, under Austrian influence. As Bishop of Imola, Chiaramonte had displayed his approbation of the French democratic and revolutionary principles. On his elevation to the papal chair he assumed the title of Pius VII.; but he continued to reside at Venice till after the battle of Marengo, when Bonaparte consented to his installation at Rome. The maintenance of the papal authority now formed part of Bonaparte's policy in the restoration which he meditated of the monarchical system in his own favour. On the 15th of July 1801, he concluded a Concordat with Pius VII., by which the papal authority, though in a modified form, was re-established in France; an act, however, extremely unpopular, and especially among the generals of the army.

The Coalition was thus gradually dissolving. Portugal was soon to be added to the list of seceding states. Bonaparte entertained a violent hatred of that country, now almost the only one of Europe that remained open to British commerce. Charles IV. of Spain, one of whose daughters had married the Prince Regent of Portugal, displaying an unwillingness to coerce that kingdom, or to admit the passage of a French army for that purpose, Lucien Bonaparte was despatched to Madrid, towards the close of 1800, to stimulate that Court to action. Assisted by the Prince of the Peace, Lucien persuaded Charles IV. to publish a declaration of

[24] Garden, t. vi. p. 271.

war against Portugal, February 18th 1801. A French army having entered Spain in April, in order to march against Portugal, Charles, to disembarrass himself of so dangerous an ally, resolved to adopt more vigorous measures. The Prince of the Peace was entrusted with an army, which soon overran a great part of Portugal, and compelled the Regent to conclude with Spain the Peace of Badajoz, June 6th 1801; the chief article of which was, that the Portuguese ports should be closed against British vessels.[25] The French troops were, however, still retained in Spain. The First Consul having expressed great dissatisfaction with the Treaty of Badajoz, and ordered his brother-in-law, Leclerc, to march upon Lisbon, Great Britain, which was then negociating with France the Peace of Amiens, advised Portugal, under these circumstances, to reconcile herself with France, releasing her, for that purpose, from all the obligations she had contracted. A treaty between the French Republic and Portugal was accordingly signed at Madrid, September 29th 1801.[26] The neutrality of Portugal was established; though the article by which the Portuguese ports were to be closed against the English and open to the French can hardly be brought under that category. The British Cabinet, however, seeing that the effects of this treaty would cease on the conclusion of the peace with France, connived at, and even promoted the treaty.

Before we advert to the negociations between France and England regarding the Peace of Amiens, we must relate some events which occurred in the north of Europe, as well as the conclusion of the French expedition to Egypt.

We have already mentioned the dissatisfaction of the Czar Paul I. at the reverses of his troops in Switzerland and Holland; a result which he attributed to the want of cordial co-operation on the part of Austria and England. Paul's irritation was increased by the refusal of Austria to restore the King of Sardinia after the conquest of Piedmont, as well as that of England to give up Malta. He affirmed that Great Britain, by a Convention of December 30th 1798, had agreed to restore that island to the Knights of St. John, of whom he had declared himself the Grand Master, while the British Cabinet denied that any such arrangement had been completed. Paul's discontent was artfully fomented by Bonaparte. The First Consul, for whom Paul had conceived a vast admiration, on account of his anti-revolutionary tendencies, entered into an active correspondence with that autocrat, and excited his irascible temper by causing to be forwarded to him all the abusive pamphlets and articles published against him in

[25] Martens, t. vii. p. 348. [26] *Ibid.* p. 373.

England. By way of courting the Czar, he sent back, newly clothed, and without ransom, the Russians who had been captured, and tuned the French journals to sound the autocrat's praises. By these arts he induced Paul to make extensive preparations for an overland attack on the English possessions in India, as well as for marching on Constantinople, in order to compel the Turks to withdraw their forces from Egypt.[27] To please his new friend, the Czar even condescended to banish Louis XVIII. from his dominions. That prince now took up his abode at Warsaw. Paul not only withdrew from the Coalition, but at length, in August 1800, at the instigation of Bonaparte, took an active part against Great Britain, by joining the northern Armed Neutrality. But the origin of that confederacy must be traced somewhat further back, to the breaking out of the French revolutionary war.

The extraordinary nature of that war, or rather of the principles which then prevailed in France, led the French, and, it must be confessed, the English also, to adopt practices of naval warfare which cannot be reconciled with the commonly received Law of Nations.[28] The Convention, rejecting the maxims formerly advocated by France respecting the privileges of the neutral flag, and even positive treaties with Denmark and other Powers, had, by a decree of May 9th 1793, authorised French ships of war and privateers to seize neutral vessels carrying provisions, although also the property of neutrals, to an enemy's port, as well as all goods belonging to an enemy. England, on her side, had by an instruction dated June 8th 1793, authorised the arrest of vessels laden with grain destined for a French port, or a port occupied by the French armies; such vessels to be sent into some British harbour, where the cargo would be bought for the account of the English Government, or the captain be permitted, on giving sufficient security, to carry his cargo to some friendly port. And, in addition to the usual laws of blockade, it was insisted that a mere declaration, or paper blockade, should be respected. This instruction was communicated to the neutral Powers, and its unusual provisions were justified on the ground that the French Government could not be regarded as a legitimate and established one. Such were the grounds urged by Mr. Hailes, the English Minister at Copen-

[27] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 62 sq.

[28] Respecting the Armed Neutrality see Garden, *Hist. des Traités*, t. vi. pp. 303—383; where several of the original documents will be found. See also *Decisions of the High Court of Admiralty during the time of Sir G. Hay and of Sir J. Marriott*, London, 1801, 4to; M. J. Marriott, *Mém. justificatif de la conduite de la Grande Bretagne en arrêtant les navires étrangers*, London, 1802, 8vo; Sulpicius, *Letters on the Northern Confederacy*.

hagen, in a note to Count Bernstorff, the Danish Foreign Minister, July 17th 1793. Mr. Hailes further urged that the circumstances of this war exempted it from the ordinary system of public law; that the French corn trade was not in the hands of private individuals, but conducted by the Executive Council and the different municipalities; that to reduce the French to famine was an important means to compel them to an equitable peace, and justified by their having armed the working classes against the general tranquillity of Europe. Mr. Hailes also protested against French privateers, with their prizes, being admitted into Danish ports, &c.

It was easy for Count Bernstorff, in an admirable note, remarkable for its dignity and moderation, to refute most of the arguments of the English minister. He exposed the mischievous doctrine that the nature of circumstances should influence the unalterable Rights of Nations, or the solemn obligation of treaties; he rejected the novel distinction attempted to be drawn between contracts made by a government or by private individuals, as well as the monstrous proposition that the same laws may be applied to a whole nation as to a blockaded place, and that an entire people, including many innocent provinces, may be reduced to submission by starvation. "One war," he observes, "may certainly differ from another by its motives, its object, it necessity, its justice, or injustice; this may be of the greatest importance for the belligerent parties, and may and ought to influence the peace, the compensations, and all such accessory considerations; but it has absolutely no concern with neutral Powers. Such Powers, no doubt, will interest themselves for those who have justice on their side, but they have no right to listen to this sentiment; neutrality, if it be not perfect, no longer exists." [29]

The views of England were, however, immediately adopted by Sweden. This difference in the policy of the two Northern Courts is explained by the nature of their treaties with England. In that with Denmark, flour, wheat, and other grain and provisions, were expressly excepted from the category of contraband of war, while in that with Sweden they were included in it. Hence the conduct observed by England was in fact favourable to the Swedes, since grain seized as contraband was not absolutely confiscated, as under her treaty it might have been, but sold on account of the proprietors. With regard to the Danes, on the other hand, the seizing of cargoes of grain was a manifest breach of treaty, which was by no means compensated by the sales effected for the owners.

[29] Bernstorff's *Mémoire*, ap. Garden, *Ibid.*, p. 317 sqq.

In the few months which elapsed from the breaking out of hostilities till August 15th 1799, no fewer than eighty-nine Danish vessels, laden with corn and other provisions, were carried into English ports. And the English Government was very slow in paying over the proceeds of the cargoes. Their value was estimated at 557,504*l.* sterling; yet in November 1794, only 38,407*l.* 13*s.* had been liquidated. Meanwhile the English Admiralty had adopted the new doctrine, that neutral nations had a right to carry to foreign countries only their own produce and manufactures; according to which the payment for the cargoes and freight of several neutral vessels was refused. In order to cut off all commerce between France and her colonies by means of neutral vessels, Great Britain also proclaimed the principle that neutrals could not carry on, in time of war, a commerce forbidden to them by a belligerent Power in time of peace. These acts were wound up by a secret order issued by the English Government in March 1794, enjoining captains to seize all vessels laden with provisions or naval stores, whatever might be their destination, and to bring them into a British port; where the crews were subjected to an interrogatory of twenty questions, of a truly inquisitorial nature.

These proceedings at length induced the Courts of Sweden and Denmark to enter into a defensive alliance for the protection of their commerce, concluded at Copenhagen, March 27th 1794.[30] By Article X., the Baltic was declared closed. But this treaty could not preserve their commerce from the vexations and tyranny of Great Britain and France. After the establishment of the Directory, the injustice exercised by France towards neutral commerce exceeded anything that had been done by England. The French law of May 23rd 1798, respecting the condemnation of prizes, by the short period which it fixed, left no time for the owners to prove their rights. Still more iniquitous was the law of January 18th 1798, which established the monstrous principle that the quality of ships, whether neuter or hostile, should be determined by their cargo; consequently, that every ship, laden wholly or *in part* with English merchandise, should be lawful prize, whoever might be the owner of the merchandise. This was virtually an order to every European Power to renounce all commerce with Great Britain; and thus a supplement to the law of October 31st 1796, which had not produced so much effect upon English trade as had been expected.

[30] Martens, t. v. p. 274.

At length, in 1798, the Kings of Sweden and Denmark, to protect the navigation of their subjects, appointed frigates and other armed vessels to sail at certain fixed periods and convoy merchant vessels bound for Lisbon and the Mediterranean. This measure was not adopted with the view of protecting *by force* the vessels under convoy, but was founded on the principle that the presence of a man of war was sufficient guarantee that these vessels were *bonâ fide* traders, having nothing on board liable to seizure, and consequently exempt from the right of search. Great Britain, however, did not recognise this principle, and the adoption of it by these Powers led to some occurrences which produced the Armed Neutrality. At first, indeed, vessels so escorted were suffered to pass by the British cruisers. The principle was first contested by Admiral Keith in the case of a Danish frigate with convoy, near Gibraltar, in 1799. More flagrant instances occurred next year. On July 25th 1800, the Danish frigate Freya, with a convoy of six vessels, was stopped by an English squadron at the entrance of the Channel, and, after some resistance, was conducted with its convoy to the Downs, where the vessels were searched, but nothing of a contraband nature discovered. A warm discussion ensued between the English and Danish Governments; Lord Whitworth was sent to Copenhagen, and a fleet of sixteen ships of war was despatched to support his arguments. Count Bernstorff proposed the mediation of Russia, which was declined, and Denmark was compelled to yield. An arrangement was concluded, August 29th,[31] by which the Danish convoys were suspended till some definitive convention should be concluded; meanwhile the Freya and her convoys were released.

Before the arrival of Lord Whitworth in Denmark, the Court of Copenhagen had notified to the Czar the outrage committed on the Danish flag, and had invoked his interference. Paul I., who already thought that he had several causes of complaint against England, resolved to constitute himself the arbiter of the Baltic and the protector of neutral rights. Accordingly, without awaiting the result of the negociations between England and Denmark, he addressed a circular declaration[32] to the Kings of Prussia, Sweden, and Denmark, who had all occasion to complain of insults to their flags, inviting them to revive the ARMED NEUTRALITY established in the reign of Catherine II. in 1780. The Convention arranged between Great Britain and Denmark caused him at first to relax the measures which he had taken to carry out this policy; but the

[31] Martens, t. vii. p. 149. [32] *Ibid.* p. 150.

news of the seizure of Malta by the English goaded him to fury, and on November 7th 1800, an embargo was laid on all British ships in the ports of the Russian Empire. This was a manifest violation of the treaty of commerce between Great Britain and Russia of February 21st 1797, which provided that, in case of a rupture, a term of at least a twelvemonth should be allowed to merchants to retire and dispose of their effects.[33]

Gustavus Adolphus IV. of Sweden was the first to adhere to the Russian proposition. In December 1800, that monarch proceeded in person to St. Petersburg, to arrange with the Czar the bases of the proposed association, and a series of treaties was signed forming a regular Quadruple Alliance, viz., between Russia and Sweden and Russia and Denmark, December 16th, and on the 18th between Russia and Prussia.[34] The main principles adopted by this confederacy were, that arms and ammunition alone are contraband of war, unless particular treaties with a belligerent determined otherwise; that goods belonging to the subjects of a belligerent Power are covered by the neutral flag, except contraband of war; that no port can be regarded as blockaded unless the blockade be real and effectual, rendering it dangerous to enter; that the declaration of an officer commanding a ship or ships of war, to the effect that there is nothing contraband on board his convoy, suffices to exempt it from search.

Mr. Drummond having demanded from the Court of Denmark, December 27th, a plain and satisfactory answer respecting the negociations with Russia, Count Bernstorff, in reply, denied that the engagements which Denmark was about to contract were either hostile to Great Britain or at variance with those of the Convention of August 29th; and he asserted that the provisional and momentary abandonment, not of a principle still undecided (viz., of the rights of convoy), but of a measure whose justice had never been, and could not be, contested, was in no way opposed to those general and permanent principles, respecting which the Northern Powers were about to come to an agreement, which, so far from compromising their neutrality, was designed only to confirm it.[35]

In consequence of this note, the English Government placed an embargo on all Russian, Swedish, and Danish vessels, January 14th 1801; and Lord Grenville, in a note to the Danish and Swedish ministers in London, declared that the new maritime code of 1780 was an innovation hurtful to the dearest interests of Great Britain; and that Russia had renounced it by the engagements which she

[33] Art. xii. ap. Martens, t. vi. p. 363.
[34] *Ibid.* t. vii. p. 172 sqq.
[35] Garden, t. vi. p. 360.

had entered into at the commencement of the present war. At the same time orders were given for the invasion of the Danish Islands in the West Indies, and for the preparation of a Baltic fleet. Meanwhile, the Czar had recalled his minister from Copenhagen, because the Court of Denmark had hesitated to ratify absolutely the treaty of December 16th. The King of Denmark, thus placed between two dangers, acceded unconditionally to the Armed Neutrality, February 27th 1801.

The British Ministry, wishing to conciliate Prussia, had laid no embargo on the ships of that Power, although she had joined the Northern League. Yet Prussia and Denmark concerted a project for excluding English vessels from the Elbe and Weser, to which also Paul I. acceded. On March 29th, 12,000 Danish troops occupied Hamburg, caused the buoys to be removed between Cuxhaven and Glückstadt, put an embargo on all ships bound for England, and seized all English property that could be found in Hamburg. Another Danish corps of 3000 men occupied Lübeck, April 5th. The Danes, however, used no reprisals against England, even in their own harbours, till March 29th, when an embargo was placed upon all English ships. An English fleet had already, under Sir Hyde Parker and Lord Nelson, reached the entrance of the Cattegat on the 18th of that month. On April 4th, 24,000 Prussian troops had entered the Electorate of Hanover by virtue of a convention with the Hanoverian Ministry. It has been thought that this occupation was arranged with the Cabinet of London in order to prevent Hanover from being seized by the French. It is at all events certain that, even after this event, no embargo was laid in England upon Prussian ships, nor in Prussia upon those of England. Bremen was also taken possession of by Prussian troops, April 12th.

We have thus explained at some length the origin of the Armed Neutrality of 1800, and of the short war with Denmark which ensued, in order that the reader may be able to form his own opinion on those events. Mr. Vansittart, who was sent as a special envoy to Copenhagen, having failed in his attempts to induce the Court of Denmark to withdraw from the Russian alliance, recourse was had to compulsion. The history of the expedition to Copenhagen, under Sir Hyde Parker and Lord Nelson, is so well known to the English reader that we need here recapitulate only the principal incidents. The Sound was passed by the English fleet, March 29th 1801, with little or no damage from the guns of Cronenberg Castle, while the Swedes on their side offered no resistance. On April 2nd, Lord Nelson, disregarding the signal of Sir Hyde Parker to withdraw from the combat, gained a decisive

victory over the Danish fleet stationed in front of Copenhagen; but not without a brave and prolonged resistance on the part of the Danes, by which the English vessels were considerably damaged. On the following day Nelson proceeded to Copenhagen to arrange an accommodation. The Danish Government rejected some advantageous offers for a defensive alliance, but concluded a convention for an armistice of fourteen weeks (April 9th):[36] during which period the Danish fleet was to remain in its actual state, and the Treaty with Russia of December 16th 1800, that is, the Armed Neutrality, was, so far as concerned Denmark, to remain in abeyance. In the West Indies, Admiral Duckworth had, in the course of March, reduced the Danish islands of St. Martin, St. Thomas, and St. John, and the Swedish island of St. Bartholomew.

A few days after the conclusion of the convention with Denmark, Sir Hyde Parker, leaving Nelson at Copenhagen, proceeded with twenty-eight ships into the Baltic. He appeared before the Swedish port of Carlscrona, April 19th, and summoned the commandant to make known his intentions. Gustavus IV., who had come to Carlscrona in person, directed the commandant to reply that the King of Sweden would remain faithful to his engagements with his allies. At this critical juncture, hostilities were arrested by intelligence of the death of Paul I., and by the change of policy adopted by his son and successor, the Emperor Alexander, immediately on his accession to the Russian throne.

Although Paul I. was loyal and generous, and not without a certain kind of intellect, his violence and eccentricities caused him to be dreaded and shunned. St. Petersburg was quitted by those who had the means to do so, to such an extent that houses fell considerably in price.[37] Paul, from his almost insane hatred of the French Revolution, exacted a respect and obedience that were puerile and fatiguing; the cut of a coat, the hour of repose, and other trifling matters of the same kind, were enforced under pain of imprisonment and exile. His recent policy and abandonment of the English alliance were also regarded by a powerful party with disapprobation. In a despotism like that of Russia, assassination comes to be looked upon as a legitimate means of escape from an absolute master, whose actions cannot be controlled. The murder of Paul seems to have been first suggested by an Italian named Ribas. One of the chief actors in it was Von der Pahlen, a gentleman of Courland, whom Paul had made governor of St. Petersburg: a post of overwhelming fatigue and responsibility, as the Emperor,

[36] Martens, *Recueil*, t. vii. p. 238.

[37] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 81.

in addition to its military duties, required a daily account of the conversations, the acts, nay, the very thoughts of the inhabitants. Pahlen got together a little band of conspirators, among whom the principal was Zouboff, a favourite of the Czar's. The Czarowitsch, Alexander himself, was, after some reluctance, induced to join the plot, though only on condition that his father's life should be respected. On the night of March 24th, Paul was murdered in his apartments, while Pahlen kept watch in the garden at the head of a strong detachment of guards. Next day it was given out that the Emperor had been carried off by an apoplexy; Alexander I., after some demonstrations of filial sorrow, received the homage of the court and senate, and the announcement of a new reign spread an unconcealed joy through the Russian metropolis.

Alexander was no sooner seated on his father's throne, than a new line of policy was adopted. One of his first acts was to inform the English admiral that he accepted the proposal made by Great Britain to his predecessor, to arrange the differences that had produced the war; and Count Pahlen, now minister of foreign affairs, requested a suspension of hostilities till he could receive the ulterior instructions of his court. This demand was acceded to by Admiral Parker, and the Northern War terminated. At the instance of the Emperor of Russia, the Danish troops evacuated Hamburg and Lübeck; the King of Prussia also showed himself willing to forward the views of Alexander. Nevertheless, the Prussian troops continued to occupy Hanover, not, it has been supposed, without the concurrence of Great Britain, till the preliminaries of a peace between that country and France had been ratified. A Congress was opened at St. Petersburg, and on June 17th 1801, a convention was concluded between Russia and Great Britain, which established a new maritime code.[38] Great Britain obtained the recognition of two principles which it deemed of the highest importance: 1. that the flag does not cover the goods; 2. that vessels under convoy may be visited. On the other hand the English Cabinet renounced some of its pretensions; especially the validity of what is called "a paper-blockade." As between Russia and Great Britain arms and ammunition alone were declared contraband of war, to the exclusion of provisions and building-timber; with other nations contraband goods were to be determined by treaty. By two separate articles, the armistice between Great Britain and the Scandinavian kingdoms was prolonged three months; and the Treaty of Commerce between Great Britain and Russia of February 21st 1797 was renewed.

[38] Martens, t. vii. p. 260.

This convention excited considerable dissatisfaction in Denmark and Sweden. Danish blood alone had flowed in maintaining principles first proclaimed by Russia, but which that Power now abandoned. The Court of Copenhagen was, however, at length compelled to yield, and acceded to the Convention of St. Petersburg, October 23rd 1801. Sweden held out longer, and did not adhere to the convention till March 30th 1802. Great Britain, in conformity with it, restored the islands which she had taken from the two Scandinavian Powers.

The Coalition, for which the Emperor Paul had taken up arms, having been dissolved by the Peace of Lunéville, Alexander, who shared not the passions and prejudices of his father, entered into negociations for a peace with France and her allies. A treaty with Spain was first concluded at Paris, October 4th 1801;[39] which, as the two nations had really no substantial grievances to allege against each other, was comprised in three short and unimportant articles. The treaty with France was signed four days later (October 8th).[40] The most remarkable article was, that the contracting Powers reciprocally engaged not to permit their subjects to maintain any correspondence with the internal enemies of the government of either, to propagate principles inimical to their respective constitutions, or to foment political troubles. The anti-revolutionary principles thus sanctioned by the First Consul, and especially the use of the word *subjects*, excited considerable animadversion in the French legislature; nevertheless, the ratification of the treaty was voted by a large majority.

A secret Convention concluded between France and Russia, October 11th, was of more political importance than the treaty of peace. This has not been published, but it is known that the two Powers agreed to act in intimate concert in arranging the affairs of Italy and Germany; that Russia should mediate the re-establishment of peace between France and the Porte; that France should withdraw her troops from Naples; that the King of Sardinia should be indemnified; that the Republic of the Seven Ionian Islands should be recognised and guaranteed; that the two Powers should unite to consolidate the general peace, to establish a just equilibrium in the four quarters of the globe, and to assure the liberty of the seas.[41]

Before we advert to the peace between France and the Porte, we must relate the termination of the French invasion of Egypt.

The furtive departure of Bonaparte had spread discontent and

[39] Martens, t. vii. p. 385. [40] *Ibid.* p. 386. [41] Garden, t. vi. p. 287 sq.

dejection among the French army in that country, and these feelings were mitigated only by their confidence in the great moral as well as military qualities of Kléber, to whom the command had been left. The Turks effected another descent at Damietta, November 1st 1799. They were repulsed with great loss; but Kléber, on learning that the Grand Vizier was approaching with a large army through Syria, and that he had taken the fortress of El Arisch, December 29th, deemed it prudent to enter into negociations. These had been begun by Bonaparte before his departure, and he had recommended Kléber to follow them up. Kléber preferred to treat through English mediation rather than directly with the Turks. He had already had some correspondence with Sir Sidney Smith, and conferences were opened on board the commodore's ship the Tiger, December 22nd. Sir Sidney Smith was not authorised to treat by his government; and, in fact, his negociations with Desaix and Poussielgue, whom Kléber had deputed, were not conducted in the name of England but of the Grand Vizier. The Tiger being driven out to sea by a violent storm, came to anchor at El Arisch, January 9th 1800, where the camp of the Grand Vizier was then established. By a Convention signed at this place January 24th, by Desaix and Poussielgue, and the plenipotentiaries of the Grand Vizier,[42] an armistice in Egypt of three months was agreed upon; the Turks engaged to transport the French army, with arms and baggage, to France, and to provide for its subsistence.

Sir Sidney Smith, at the time this Convention was arranged, had no reason to suspect that it would be distasteful to his government. But meanwhile the English Cabinet, relying apparently on an intercepted letter of Kléber's, in which the distress to which the French army had been reduced was painted in the most vivid colours, had resolved to listen to no terms with them short of a surrender as prisoners of war; and they had already given Lord Keith, their admiral in the Mediterranean, secret instructions to this effect, December 15th 1799. Sir Sidney Smith did not learn these orders till February 22nd, at Cyprus; and he immediately hastened to communicate them to Kléber lest that general should have reason to complain that he had been deceived.[43] Kléber had already restored Salahieh, Catieh, Belbeis, and Damietta to the Grand Vizier, when he received a summons from Lord Keith to surrender at discretion. With a natural irritation he communicated it to his troops, and with the laconic address, "Soldiers! a victory

[42] Martens, t. vii. p. 1.

[43] Garden, t. vi. p. 214.

is the only answer to such insolence: Let us march!" he immediately resumed hostilities. The Turks were completely defeated at Heliopolis, March 20th. But Kléber was assassinated by a fanatical Turk, June 14th; when the command devolved to Menou, one of the most incompetent of the French generals. Kléber had contemplated the renewal of negociations. Menou, on the contrary, who, with the name of Abdallah, had assumed the Mahometan faith, and married a Turkish wife, was determined to remain in Egypt in spite of the English and the Turks, and even of his own army. Thus the English Cabinet had missed an opportunity which it recovered only at great expense and bloodshed. They now wished to retract, but Menou would not hear of the capitulation of El Arisch; it became necessary to reduce him by force, and General Abercrombie was despatched to Egypt with 17,000 men. Lord Elgin, British Minister at Constantinople, pressed the Porte to assist. But Paul I. had inspired the Turks with a distrust of England; the Turkish armament was retarded, and Abercrombie, after waiting in vain for the Ottoman fleet, disembarking near Aboukir, March 1st 1801, after a sharp contest made himself master of that place. In the battle of Canopus, or Rhamanieh, March 21st, Menou was defeated with a loss of 1700 killed and 2000 prisoners. But Abercrombie received a mortal wound, and Menou contrived to retreat in good order to Alexandria.

The command of the English army now devolved on General Hutchinson, who, being reinforced by 6000 Turks, took Rosetta, April 19th. Reinforcements from the East Indies, under General Baird, as well as from the Cape of Good Hope, disembarked at Cosseir on the Red Sea, but came too late to be of any service. An army of 20,000 Turks, marching through Syria, had joined the English, June 5th; and General Belliard, commandant of Cairo, seeing no hope of resisting such superior forces, signed a capitulation, June 27th 1801.[44] By virtue of this capitulation, 14,000 men, including civil officers and scientific and literary men, were carried to Toulon free of expense; which port they reached in September. As Menou refused to include in the capitulation the garrison of Alexandria, that place was invested, and had to suffer all the horrors of a siege. At length, despairing of relief, which had been vainly attempted by Admiral Gantheaume, Menou was compelled to capitulate, August 30th. He did not obtain such advantageous terms as Belliard. The French were obliged to relinquish their Arab MSS., maps, and objects of antiquity, and to surrender their vessels and the greater part of their guns.

[44] Martens, t. vii. p. 22.

The Porte being assured of the evacuation of Egypt by the French, the preliminaries of a peace with France were signed at Paris October 9th 1801; but they were not converted into a definitive treaty till June 25th 1802, after the conclusion of the Peace of Amiens between France and England.[45] The Turkish dominions were to be placed in the *status quo* before the war; the French were to enjoy all their former privileges of navigation and commerce, and particularly were to have the right of entering the Black Sea. The Porte acceded to the Treaty of Amiens.

After the Peace of Lunéville, France had no active opponent except Great Britain. The First Consul was sincerely desirous of a peace with this country also. With the view of procuring it, M. Otto, who had been *chargé d'affaires* at Berlin, a man of conciliating manners and well acquainted with the English language and customs, was sent to London as commissioner for treating with regard to prisoners of war; and he availed himself of the opportunities thus afforded to open indirect communications with the English ministers and other influential statesmen. These views were promoted by a change in the English Ministry. Mr. Pitt resigned office, February 9th 1801, in consequence of his advocacy of Catholic emancipation; a measure which George III. would not hear of. Mr. Pitt was succeeded as Premier by Mr. Henry Addington, the Speaker of the House of Commons; Lord Hawkesbury became Foreign Secretary instead of Lord Grenville, and Lord Hobart succeeded Mr. Dundas in the War Department. The new ministers were inclined for peace. Immediately on their accession to office they despatched to Paris one Messeria, a Corsican, to sound the intentions of Bonaparte, and to propose the opening of a conference. The First Consul's inclination for peace had, however, at this time somewhat abated. He beheld in the North a formidable combination against England: the Emperor Paul I. seemed warmly disposed to second all the French plans of aggression, while Egypt continued to be occupied by the troops of the Republic. Negociations, indeed, still went on, but in a desultory manner. At the same time Bonaparte sought to create alarm in England by preparations for an invasion. Camps had been formed at different points on the French coast from Ostend to Brest; a large force was stationed at Boulogne, and a great many vessels and flat boats had been collected in the different harbours. Lord Nelson was specially commissioned to watch and frustrate these preparations; but though he was fully persuaded that an invasion could not be successfully

[45] Martens, t. vii. pp. 391, 416.

attempted, the victor of Aboukir and Copenhagen failed in an attempt to destroy the French flotilla at Boulogne. The reverses of the French arms in Egypt, the death of the Emperor Paul, the dissolution of the Northern Confederacy, the ascendency of British maritime power, discontents in Holland, Switzerland and Piedmont, discussions in Germany respecting the execution of the Treaty of Lunéville, and the indemnification of dispossessed princes, the state of public opinion in France, and other causes inclined the French Consul more seriously to peace. Preliminaries were signed at London, October 1st 1801. Amiens was fixed upon as the place for negociating a definitive treaty, which was to include Spain and the Batavian Republic; and conferences were opened early in December. Great Britain was represented by the Marquis Cornwallis, France by Joseph Bonaparte. The Chevalier Azara and M. Schimmelpenninck were the plenipotentiaries for Spain and Holland, but took no part in the general conferences; they were appealed to only when the interests of those Powers were concerned. Malta was the chief obstacle to an arrangement, and occasioned long and warm discussions. The English Cabinet was naturally loth to relinquish a possession which had cost so much pains to acquire, which by its position was so important with respect to Egypt and the East, and which, if that contingency were not duly provided against, would probably again fall into the hands of the French. At length, however, the definitive Peace of Amiens was signed, March 27th 1802.[46] The following were the principal conditions. The Isle of Trinidad was ceded by Spain to Great Britain, and Ceylon by the Dutch: Great Britain restored all her other conquests. Portugal was to make some concessions to France in Guiana, and to cede to Spain the province of Olivença. The Republic of the Seven Ionian Islands was recognised. These islands, taken by the French from the Venetians, and recaptured by the combined Russian and Ottoman fleets, had been singularly enough erected into a Republic[47] by the two most despotic governments in the world, as mutual jealousies would not permit their possession by either of the conquering Powers. They were nominally placed under the suzerainty of the Porte, but with Russian guarantee of their integrity. The British Cabinet preferred passing over North Italy in silence to recognising the new Italian republics. In the preceding January, Bonaparte had caused himself to be elected president of the Cisalpine Republic, and had changed its name to that of the "Italian Republic."

[46] Martens, t. vii. p. 404. The preliminaries, *Ibid.* p. 377.

[47] By a convention of March 21st 1800. Martens, *Ibid.*, p. 41.

By Article X. of the Treaty of Amiens, Malta and its dependent isles was to be restored to the Order of St. John of Jerusalem. The Knights of the Tongues which continued to subsist were to return to Malta and elect a Grand Master; and this election was to supersede any former one. There were to be no English nor French Tongues—the latter comprehending those of Provence, Auvergne, and France; but, in fact, the English Tongue had long ceased to exist, and those of France had been abolished by the Revolution. No Frenchman or Englishman was to be admitted into the Order; and a Maltese Tongue was to be erected, to be supported by the revenues of the island. Malta was to be evacuated by the British troops within three months after the exchange of ratifications, provided the Grand Master was ready to take possession, and that a garrison of 2000 men, to be provided by the King of the Two Sicilies, had arrived. Half at least of the garrison was to be composed of natives of Malta. The Maltese ports to be open to all nations except the States of Barbary. The present arrangement and the independence of the island, to be guaranteed by France, Great Britain, Austria, Spain, Russia, and Prussia. The other more remarkable conditions of this Treaty were that the French troops should evacuate the kingdom of Naples and the Roman State, and the British all the ports and islands in the Mediterranean and Adriatic. The French fisheries in Newfoundland and the Gulf of St. Lawrence were to be restored to the footing they were on before the war. The House of Nassau was to be compensated for the loss of property accruing from the revolution in Holland: but the august and sovereign character of that House was ignored, nor was it stated whence the compensation was to be derived.

By the great mass of the English people, overwhelmed with the burthens of war, the Peace of Amiens was hailed with delight; the more discerning portion of the public foresaw that it was not likely to be durable. None of the objects of the war had in fact been obtained. All that England could show for her enormous expenditure of blood and treasure during a period of nine years, were the comparatively unimportant possessions of Trinidad and Ceylon, which belonged to the allies of France, while France herself, the principal party in the war, had not been deprived of a single possession, and found her influence on the Continent increased to a formidable extent by connivance at her annexations and the republics which she had established in Italy and the Netherlands. It was perhaps impossible for England, which now stood alone, to attempt to overturn these arrangements, and on the whole the peace may have been necessary; but at the same time it was not

difficult to foresee that it contained the germs of future wars and calamities.[48] In France, on the contrary, the Peace of Amiens prodigiously increased the renown of the First Consul, who appeared to have established by negociations the acquisitions won by his arms. The legislature resounded with his praises. It was declared that he was entitled to some signal mark of national gratitude; on May 8th he was re-elected consul for an additional ten years, and a few months after (August 2nd 1802) he was rewarded with the Consulate for life.

[48] See especially Mr. Windham's speech on the Address, October 29th; Adolphus, vol. vii. p. 545. Also Lord Grenville's in the Lords. Mr. Pitt in general defended the treaty, but regretted the loss of Malta, *Ibid.* p. 553.

CHAPTER XI.

AFTER the Peace of Amiens, the attention of Bonaparte was principally directed to the consolidation of his own power. With this view he began to restore in his own favour the absolutism of the ancient *régime*, and to banish the traces of the Revolution by re-establishing a courtly etiquette introducing substitutes for the ancient distinctions of rank, restoring an external decency of manners, and the observances and ceremonies of religion. In March 1802, twenty of the more turbulent tribunes were ejected by an operation of the senate, and the number of the tribunate reduced to eighty. The legislative body also underwent a purification. The Revolution of 16th *Thermidor*, *an X* (August 2nd 1802), when Bonaparte was named consul for life by the pretended suffrages of the people, established a more absolute despotism than any that France had yet experienced. The electors were now to be appointed for life, and the First Consul could increase their number. The senate, the mere creatures of Bonaparte, were invested with power to alter the institutions of the state, and to dissolve the tribunate and legislative body.* The Council of State was recognised as a constituted authority, and its number was increased. The tribunate underwent a second reduction to the number of fifty, by the elimination of thirty more of its boldest members. A sort of hierarchy was established among the tribunals by the appointment of a court of cassation, with power to censure and even suspend the inferior judges; while the whole were subordinate to the minister of justice. Such were the rapid strides of despotism!

Along with liberty, such as it had been, Bonaparte sought also to abolish equality. A sort of new order of nobility was established by the institution of a Legion of Honour (May 19th 1802), destined to confer pecuniary rewards and marks of distinction on those who had signalised themselves by their civil or military services. The Legion was to consist of about 7000 men, divided into cohorts and dispersed in different parts of France. The cohorts contained privates, subaltern and higher officers, with salaries varying according to rank from between 200 and 300 francs to 5000.[1] This law

[1] Goldsmith, *Recueil, &c.*, t. i. p. 426.

was very strongly opposed. It passed the legislature only by a small majority, and was very unpopular out of doors. Those first decorated with the *insignia* of the order received them with a sort of derisive contempt; but the order ultimately became a powerful means of attaching men to Bonaparte's service. Among other instruments of despotism may be mentioned a law for a conscription (May 18th 1802), which placed 120,000 recruits at the disposal of the First Consul's military ambition.

The Concordat arranged with Pope Pius VII. in the previous year was adopted by the legislature April 8th 1802. By this act, nine archbishopries and forty-one bishopries, with chapters, were re-established in France. The salary of an archbishop was fixed at 15,000 francs: of a bishop at 10,000; of a curé of the first class, 1500; of the second class, 1000. The liberties of the Gallican Church were defined in seventy-seven articles, which were to form the only ecclesiastical code recognised by the French tribunals. Protestant worship was also admitted, and regulated by forty-four articles. The observance of Sunday and of the four grand festivals was restored; and the Government ceased to employ the system of decades, the first step towards the abandonment of the republican calendar. The completion of the Concordat was celebrated with great pomp at Nôtre Dame. The First Consul and his suite proceeded thither in the royal carriages, amid salvos of artillery, and with all the etiquette of monarchy.[2] The pliant Pius VII. displayed his gratitude to Talleyrand, the ex-bishop of Autun, by a Brief of June 29th, releasing him from all ecclesiastical censures, authorising him to wear a secular dress, and to take upon himself the conduct of secular affairs. Under this authority Talleyrand soon afterwards married.[3]

It would be unjust not to mention that, along with his acts of despotism, Bonaparte introduced many excellent alterations and reforms, by protecting religion and good manners, encouraging the arts and sciences, and all that improves and adorns society, and by setting an example of social propriety and the virtues of domestic life. He applied his attention to the development of manufactures and commerce, and to the construction of canals, roads, ports, bridges, and other public works. He promoted education by establishing in the different *communes* primary and secondary schools, as well as special schools and lyceums supported at the public

[2] The Concordat, or treaty of Bonaparte with the Pope, had been arranged without any synod, between Joseph Bonaparte and Cardinal Consalvi, with the aid of Cardinal Spina and two or three theologians. It will be found in Martens' *Recueil*, t. vii. p. 353 sqq. Cf. L'Abbé de Pradt, *Les Quatre Concordats*, t. i.

[3] Montgaillard, t. v. p. 476.

expense. He took a personal share in the labours of the committees which had been appointed to draw up new codes of civil and criminal law. He performed an act of policy as well as justice by granting a general amnesty, April 26th 1802, to all emigrants (except about 1000 attached to the person of the *Pretender*, Louis XVIII.), who should return to France before September 23rd. The lists of emigrants formed nine volumes, and presented a total of near 150,000 names.[4] Large quantities of them were already in France, but after this invitation they returned in great numbers; and in a few years many of the former courtiers of Versailles might be observed worshipping the new idol who had established himself in the palace of the Bourbons. Returned emigrants were to remain ten years under the surveillance of the Government. They could not reclaim such property as had been disposed of by the Republic; but, with certain exceptions, what still remained in the hands of the state was to be restored to them.

The reduction of St. Domingo added another laurel to the First Consul's wreath. That island had long been in a state of rebellion, which the maritime inferiority of the French prevented them from quelling. Under the conduct of Toussaint l'Ouverture, a man who, though born in the condition of a common negro slave, possessed great intelligence and many admirable qualities, the negroes of St. Domingo, after subduing the Spanish portion of that island, had, in July 1801, constituted it and some adjacent islands into a separate colony, decreed a constitution and the perpetual abolition of slavery, and appointed Toussaint l'Ouverture to be their governor. After the signing of the preliminary treaty with England, Bonaparte despatched a fleet to the West Indies, with a considerable land force under Le Clerc; which, in a few months, chiefly through the rivalry and disunion that prevailed among the negroes, succeeded in reducing them to obedience. Cristophe, the relative and lieutenant of Toussaint, was the first to surrender, and in May 1802 Toussaint himself tendered his submission. He was allowed to retire to his estate; but, in the month of June, he was treacherously seized and carried to France; and after experiencing the greatest rigour during the passage, was imprisoned in the Castle of Joux, in Normandy.

With regard to foreign affairs, Bonaparte, partly by diplomacy, partly by fresh aggressions, continued after the Peace of Amiens to extend and confirm the influence of France upon the Continent. By the former of these methods he intervened in the affairs of

[4] Montgaillard, t. v. p. 466.

Germany, succeeded in overturning some of the fundamental principles of the German Empire, and in rendering it less able to resist his future attacks: an object, however, in which he could not have succeeded but for the jealousies and quarrels, the shortsighted ambition and the selfish policy, of Austria and Prussia.

The Peace of Lunéville, as we have seen, had been concluded by the Emperor Francis II., not only for his Austrian dominions, but also for the German body; it had been ratified by the electors, princes, and states of the Empire, March 7th 1801; and it remained to indemnify, under the seventh article of the treaty, the princes who had been deprived of their possessions by the cession of the left bank of the Rhine, as well as the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena, who had been driven from their Italian dominions. We have already seen that the Empire had consented at the Congress of Rastadt to the cession of the left bank of the Rhine, and had admitted the principle that the princes dispossessed by this cession should be compensated by the secularisation of ecclesiastical domains: which now remained to be carried out. Francis was invited to conduct the settlement of the Empire by a decree of the Diet of Ratisbon, April 30th 1801. The participation of France in this matter was not then anticipated. No such participation had been stipulated in the Treaty of Lunéville, though it had been in the secret articles of Campo Formio. Had the Emperor immediately complied with the requisition of the Diet, the affair might have been arranged without French intervention, but the Cabinet of Vienna adopted the fatal policy of delay. Thugut had now retired from the ministry, and had been succeeded by Count Franz Colloredo; but the affairs of Austria were in reality directed by the vice-chancellor, Count Cobentzl. Francis himself appears to have suggested the interference of France, with the intention probably of anticipating Prussia and Bavaria in such an appeal.[5] Nothing could have been more ill-advised than this step. It failed in conciliating the First Consul, who, throughout the negociations, took a decided part against Austria.

On October 8th 1801, the Diet appointed a deputation of eight members, with unlimited powers to settle the question of indemnification and its collateral issues. These plenipotentiaries were the delegates of the Electors of Mentz, Bohemia (the Emperor), Saxony, Brandenburg (King of Prussia), Bavaria, of the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, of the Duke of Würtemberg, and

[5] Menzel, *N. Gesch. der Deutschen*, B. vi. S. 398 f.

the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel. But the Cabinet of Vienna suffered the matter to remain in abeyance another ten months; during which Bonaparte had made peace with England, and had concluded with the Emperor Alexander the Convention already mentioned for their joint action in the affairs of Germany, and, indeed, of the whole world.[6] Alexander, who was connected by ties of relationship with several of the German princes, was anxious to take a part in the settlement of Germany; a proceeding also conformable to the policy of his grandmother, Catherine II., who, in the Peace of Teschen, had exhibited herself as protectress of the Empire. Alexander's interview with Frederick William III. at Memel, in June 1802, which produced a personal friendship between those two monarchs, was an incident calculated to have an injurious effect upon the interests of Austria.

The Emperor Francis, finding that nothing was to be gained by delay, at length called the Deputation together, August 2nd 1802. But France and Russia had now taken the matter into their own hands. Early in 1802 Paris had become the centre of negociations respecting the affairs of Germany. As Austria and Prussia condescended to treat there respecting their particular indemnifications, it is more excusable that the minor German princes should have adopted the same method. Bonaparte and Talleyrand were courted, as well as their dependents; interest was made even with clerks and servants, and bargains were struck in Parisian garrets for German towns and districts.[7] The result of these negociations was five treaties; namely, two between France and Prussia, May 23rd 1802; one between France and Bavaria, May 24th; one between France and Russia, June 3rd; and one between France and Würtemberg, June 20th. Most of these treaties were secret, but their purport has since transpired. It is unnecessary here to state the substance of them;[8] their effects will appear in the final settlement of the Empire. We need only state that by one of the treaties with France, the King of Prussia guaranteed all the arrangements made by the First Consul in Italy; namely, the existence of the Italian Republic, of the Kingdom of Etruria, and of the annexation of Piedmont to France, which we shall have to mention further on. The second treaty with Prussia concerned the House of Nassau. When the Peace of Amiens was signed, France entered into an engagement with the Batavian Republic, that the compensation for the House of Nassau stipulated by that treaty should not be at the expense of the Dutch. By the treaty between France and

[6] See above, p. 352.
[7] Menzel, *Ibid.*, p. 339.
[8] It is given by Garden, t. vii. p. 140 sqq.

Prussia, May 24th,[9] it was agreed that the Prince of Nassau-Orange-Dillenburg-Diez should receive compensation in Germany; but he was to renounce for himself and his heirs the dignity of Stadtholder, and all his estates and domains in the Batavian Republic, except the pensions settled on him. In consequence of these treaties, Prussia and Bavaria proceeded to occupy the districts assigned to them as indemnifications, before the Deputation of the Empire that was to sanction the occupation had even assembled. Austria, however, anticipated Bavaria in occupying the town of Passau, which the Emperor claimed for his brother the Grand Duke of Tuscany; and Austrian troops also took possession of the Archbishopric of Salzburg. The imperial authority convoking the Deputation purported that they were to arrange the questions arising out of the 5th and 7th Articles of the Treaty of Lunéville, with the Emperor's plenipotentiary, and *in conjunction with the French Government.* During the Emperor's delay, France and Russia had drawn up a scheme of indemnification; their ministers, M. Laforest and M. de Klüpffell, attended the sittings of the Deputation as mediators; and before the opening of the conferences they handed in the scheme alluded to, with the intimation that it was the will of the Emperor of Russia and of the First Consul that it should not be altered, and that the Deputation must abstain from delay in settling this matter beyond the two months allowed to them.[10] The Deputation did not literally comply with these injunctions. Their *Recess* was not completed till February 25th 1803; and though in all matters which concerned the policy of the French and Russian Governments they observed the course dictated to them, they were allowed more liberty in such questions as regarded only the internal affairs of Germany. It is impossible for us to detail all the regulations that were now adopted, nor is it necessary in this general history.[11] It will suffice to state the principal changes thus introduced.

The Emperor, for the cession of Ortenau to the Duke of Modena, condescended to receive from the hands of France and Russia Trent and Brixen, two bishoprics situated in his own dominions. The Breisgau and Ortenau were made over to the Duke of Modena in compensation for his Italian dominions. The Emperor's brother Ferdinand, Grand Duke of Tuscany, received on the same account the Archbishopric of Salzburg, Berchtolsgaden, and parts of the Bishoprics of Passau and Eichstädt, with the title

[9] Martens, t. vii. p. 424.
[10] Menzel, *Ibid.*, p. 405.
[11] A full account of the subject will be found in the Comte de Garden's work, who has dedicated to it nearly the whole of his seventh volume.

of Elector of Salzburg. Prussia obtained the lion's share in this partition of spoils. By the cession of her dominions on the left bank of the Rhine she had lost part of the duchy of Clèves, the principality of Mœurs, the duchy of Gueldres, Sevenier, Huyssen, and Malburg, and the tolls of the Rhine and Meuse. These territories were computed at forty-eight German square miles, containing 137,000 inhabitants, with an estimated revenue of 1,400,000 florins. In lieu of them she received the bishopries of Hildesheim and Paderborn, part of the bishopric of Münster, the Eichsfeld with Trefurt, Erfurt, and Untergleichen, Mülhausen, Nordhausen, Goslar, Herforden, Quedlinburg, Elten, Essen, Werden, and Cappenburg; in all 221 square miles, with 526,000 inhabitants, and a revenue of 3,800,000 florins. With such success had she courted the ruling powers! Bavaria, which had lost in the Palatinate and in the duchies of Jülich and Zwey-Brücken, in Alsace, &c., 220 square miles, with a population of 780,000 souls, and a revenue of 5,870,000 florins, received instead the bishopries of Würtzburg, Bamberg, Augsburg, Freysing, Passau, with numerous abbeys and other places, reckoned at 268 square miles, containing 792,000 inhabitants, and producing a revenue of 6,178,000 florins. The Margrave of Baden, the Duke of Würtemberg, the two branches of the House of Hesse (Cassel and Darmstadt) also received, through the favour of the French and Russian Governments, large accessions of territory. The first of these princes, in particular, was compensated more than sixfold for his territorial losses, and his revenues were doubled. The Prince of Nassau-Orange obtained the bishopries of Fulda and Corvey, the imperial city of Dortmund, the abbey of Weingarten, and other places. The other branches of the House of Nassau also received compensations, and George III., as Elector of Hanover and Brunswick-Lüneburg, for certain rights and pretensions which he lost, received the bishopric of Osnabrück. By the new arrangement, two of the three spiritual Electors, those of Cologne and Trèves, vanished entirely from the German system. The Elector of Mentz, Charles von Dalberg, archchancellor of the Empire, who had courted the First Consul with success, was alone spared. The archiepiscopal seat of Mentz was transferred to the cathedral church of Ratisbon, and was endowed, as to its temporalities, with the principalities of Aschaffenburg and Ratisbon, with a revenue of one million florins. Pope Pius VII. affected to shut his eyes to the secularisation of ecclesiastical property, and the suppression of convents throughout Germany; though he made an attempt at the Congress of Vienna to obtain a reversal of these acts, but without success. The number of Electors was more than made

up by the elevation to that dignity of the Duke of Würtemberg, the Margrave of Baden, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, and of the Grand Duke of Tuscany as Elector of Salzburg. Thus the majority of the Electors became Protestant instead of Catholic. Of the forty-five free cities of the Empire, only six now remained, those of Frankfort, Augsburg, Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg, and Nuremberg. Four had fallen to the share of France; namely, Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle, Worms and Spire. Into other minor changes we cannot enter; nor is it necessary. The German Empire itself, already prostrate at the feet of Bonaparte, was soon to disappear; to which catastrophe these changes were but the prelude.

Bonaparte's interference in the affairs of Switzerland, though totally unjustifiable, since the independence of that country and the right to form its own government had been guaranteed by the Peace of Lunéville, was not, however, so tyrannical and injurious as some of his other steps of the same kind. After the establishment of the Helvetic Republic, two political parties had grown up in Switzerland, called *Unitarians*, or *Unionists*, and *Federalists*. The Unitarians were for establishing a central government, and merging the aristocratic towns and democratic cantons in one common system of political and civil equality. The Federalists, on the contrary, who formed the much larger portion of the nation, thinking it impossible to unite under one form of government many small bodies of people differing in their language, their customs, and their religion, were for maintaining the ancient system of separate governments with a federal diet. Through the influence of the French party, however, which favoured the Unitarians, an extraordinary assembly of forty-eight Notables from all the Cantons was convened at Bern, April 17th 1802, and a central government proclaimed May 20th. To confirm this change, they even ventured to appeal to universal suffrage; and though their plan was condemned by a large majority, yet, as a great part of the people had not voted, they with shameless audacity took their silence for consent, and proclaimed the establishment of the new constitution. But the primitive cantons, led by the Landamman and patriot, Aloys Reding, flew to arms, and prepared to overthrow the new government by force. At this juncture, Bonaparte withdrew the French troops from Switzerland, with the view probably of bringing the two parties into collision, and thus obtaining a plausible pretence for interfering. Under the influence of Reding, a congress of the primitive cantons now assembled at Schwytz, declared their independence, and their determination to establish a constitution suited to their wants; but at the same time they

expressed their willingness to come to an arrangement with the central government; and Reding communicated what had been done to the First Consul, with whom he had had an interview in the previous December, and who, he had reason to think, would not disapprove of their proceedings. The insurrection spread to several other cantons; the peasantry took up arms, the Helvetic Government, after applying to Bonaparte for aid, which was at first refused, was driven from Bern, and compelled to retire to Lausanne, and the Federal Diet was re-established. But the Helvetic Government was soon afterwards restored by a proclamation of Bonaparte, dated at St. Cloud, September 30th 1802. The primitive cantons, led by Reding, prepared to resist; but Ney having entered Switzerland with a large force, the Diet, after protesting against this violence, declared itself dissolved. Ney caused Reding, Herzel, and some other leaders to be arrested. Reding was imprisoned at Aarburg, and subsequently in the castle of Chillon. Deputies from both parties were now invited to Paris, and after considerable discussion, the First Consul arranged their differences by an *Act of Mediation*, February 19th 1803. The constitution thus established was perhaps as good as the circumstances would admit. The different cantons, which, by the erection of six new ones, namely, Aargau, St. Gall, the Grison Leagues, the Tessin, Turgovia, and Leman, or Pays de Vaud, had been increased to nineteen, were placed under governments more or less democratic or aristocratic, agreeably to their ancient customs. A Federal Diet was appointed to meet in alternate years at Friburg, Bern, Soleure, Basle, Zürich, and Lucerne, which thus became in turn *directorial cantons*. The Avoyer, or Burgomaster, of each of these cantons became, during its directorial year, Landamman of Switzerland; in which capacity he presided over the Diet, communicated with foreign ministers, &c. On September 27th 1803, a new defensive alliance was concluded between France and Switzerland.[12] This treaty was more favourable to the Swiss than the alliance of 1798, which was offensive as well as defensive, thus involving them in all the French wars. By the new treaty it was agreed that the French should have in their service 16,000 Swiss. Ney, however, compelled the Swiss to purchase these advantages by delivering up their arms and paying 625,000 francs for costs; nor did he depart

[12] Martens, t. viii. p. 139. The constitutions of the different cantons will also be found in the same collection, *Suppl.* t. iii. p. 373. An analysis of the Act of Mediation in Garden, t. viii. p. 28 sqq. See also Muralt, *Hans von Reinhard, Bürgermeister des eidgenössischen Standes Zürich und Landamman der Schweitz*; a life of one of the chief aristocratical leaders in the revolution.

with his army till the treaty had been arranged according to Bonaparte's wishes.

A more flagrant act of the First Consul's at this time was the seizure and annexation of Piedmont. Although that country was reconquered by the Austro-Russian army in 1799, the King of Sardinia had not been restored when, by the battle of Marengo, it came again into the possession of the French. Bonaparte then united part of it to the Cisalpine Republic, and promised to erect the rest into a separate State; but he afterwards changed his mind; and by a decree of April 20th 1801, ordered that Piedmont should form a military division of France under an administrator-general. Such was its state at the time of the Peace of Amiens. The English Cabinet in that treaty had taken no notice of the affairs of the King of Sardinia, Tuscany, Parma, Holland, and Switzerland. The Emperor of Russia, however, in the convention with the First Consul of October 11th 1801,[13] had stipulated an indemnification for Charles Emanuel IV., a condition which he had renewed in ratifying the Treaty of Paris of June 3rd 1802.[14] The English ministers were probably not ignorant of this engagement; and by trusting to it for justice towards the King of Sardinia, passed him over in silence rather than recognise or discuss the other proceedings of France in Northern Italy. But Charles Emanuel, disgusted with the injustice and insults to which he was exposed, having abdicated his throne in favour of his brother Victor Emanuel, Duke of Aosta, June 4th 1802, Bonaparte, in spite of his agreement with Russia, caused that part of Piedmont which had not been united to the Italian Republic to be annexed to France, as the twenty-seventh Military Department, by a formal *Senatus-Consulte* of September 11th 1802. A little after, October 11th, on the death of Ferdinand de Bourbon, Duke of Parma, father of the King of Etruria, that duchy was also seized by the rapacious French Republic. The isle of Elba had also been united to France by a *Senatus-Consulte* of August 26th.

Besides these aggressions, Bonaparte had given Holland a new Constitution, November 1801, by which the Batavian Government, in imitation of the French Consulate of 1800, became almost aristocratic. The legislative body was now composed of no more than thirty-three members; and the Republic at length received in the person of Schimmelpenninck, a sort of chief like the President of the United States, who, with the title of Grand Pensionary, was invested with a more extensive authority than the House of Orange

[13] Supra, p. 352. Cf. *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 183. [14] *Ibid.* t. vii. p. 141.

had ever enjoyed; a first step towards that monarchy which it was destined soon to become.[15]

These proceedings, which so plainly showed the aggressive ambition of the First Consul, could not be regarded with indifference in England; and, unfortunately, there were many other causes of complaint, on both sides, which revealed to all reflecting persons that the peace between Great Britain and France could not be long preserved. After the conclusion of the preliminaries, but before the definitive treaty of peace was signed, Bonaparte had displayed the malignancy of his feelings towards England by causing the Fame packet, bound to Jersey, but driven into Cherbourg by stress of weather, to be seized and confiscated, agreeably to a law passed by the Convention in the time of Robespierre. Many other instances of the same kind occurred, and all explanations and remonstrances were disregarded or rejected. Bonaparte also refused to restore three English vessels captured in India after the peace. English commerce was prohibited through French influence in Holland, Spain, and Italy, and English property sequestrated during the war was still retained, although restitution had been made of all French property agreeably to the treaty.[16] The irritation on both sides was kept alive by scurrilous and defamatory articles published in newspapers and pamphlets. Some of the French emigrants, as well as English writers, abused the liberty of the press in England to make unwarrantable attacks upon the First Consul and his policy; and a Frenchman named Peltier even went the length of openly recommending the assassination of Bonaparte. When the First Consul complained of these attacks, the English Ministry truly replied that they had no power to suppress them, except by civil action; and a suit was actually instituted against Peltier, whose proposition had excited universal disgust in England. On the other hand, libels equally atrocious upon English statesmen were published with impunity in the French journals, of course with the connivance of the Government, which had the power to suppress them; nay, the most virulent of them appeared in the *Moniteur*, the official organ of the Government, and some of them are known to have proceeded from the hand of Bonaparte himself.[17] Another cause of complaint on the

[15] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 293 sq.

[16] *Ibid.* t. viii. p. 178 sq.

[17] *Ibid.* t. viii. p. 184. A specimen of them will be found in the *Moniteur* of 20 Thermidor an X (Aug. 8th 1802); in which Pitt is accused of having encouraged the murder of Louis XVI., of being the author of the September massacres at Paris, and of the revolts of Toulon, Lyon, and La Vendée. In the previous number it was asserted, that if the contriver of the infernal machine had succeeded in destroying Bonaparte, he would have been made a Knight of the Garter!

part of England was the employment of French spies, under the guise of commercial agents, in several of the chief ports of the Empire.

The relations between France and England had become so unsatisfactory that already on opening the session, November 23rd 1802, George III. had given intimation that the duration of the peace could hardly be relied on. Mr. Addington still endeavoured to conciliate matters, though the prevalent opinion in England appeared to be adverse to the maintenance of the peace. This feeling was vastly strengthened by the official publication in the *Moniteur* (January 30th 1803) of Colonel Sebastiani's Report of his mission to Egypt. The French agents, though his mission was disguised under the pretence of commercial interests, spoke openly of his intrigues with the Egyptian Pashas and Sheiks, reported his examination of the fortifications and defences of the country, gave an estimate of the material and moral force of the Turkish army, and expressed an opinion that 6000 Frenchmen would suffice for the conquest of Egypt.[18] The only inference that could be drawn from all this was that the views of the First Consul were still directed towards the occupation of that country. The Report was moreover offensive by the manner in which it spoke of General Stuart and the English army in Egypt; affirming, among other things, that the army was supported by the Pasha of Cairo, and that thrice as much was drawn as was necessary for its subsistence. Sebastiani on his return visited Djezzar Pasha at Acre, whose friendship he endeavoured to obtain. He also proceeded to the Ionian Islands, and announced, as the result of his observations and conduct, that they were ready to declare for France at the shortest notice.

Lord Whitworth, the English ambassador at Paris, urged this Report, and several other alleged grievances, on the notice of the French Government. Among these were the annexation of Piedmont, and the interference in the affairs of Switzerland. But Piedmont had been occupied, though not formally annexed, by the French before the signature of the Treaty of Amiens; it had not been even mentioned in that treaty; and Lord Hawkesbury was therefore driven to the sophistical argument that the aggrandisement of France since the peace having altered the relative conditions of the two countries when it was made, rendered England entitled to a compensation. If this argument was inadmissible, still more so was the English claim to satisfaction by

[18] The Report will be found *in extenso* in Garden, t. viii. pp. 110–132.

seizing Malta, the property of a third party. "The representations of the English Cabinet respecting Switzerland were not less unfortunate. The affairs of that country had been regulated by the Treaty of Lunéville; and therefore, if the Swiss had been aggrieved, it was for the Emperor, and not for England, to interfere. Besides, as a matter of fact, the French Act of Mediation and the subsequent treaty, had actually rendered Switzerland less dependent upon France than it had been since 1799.

The French Government, on their side, had several grievances to allege, and some of them perhaps better founded than those urged by England. We cannot, indeed, place in this category the First Consul's demand that the princes of the House of Bourbon, actually in England, should be recommended to proceed to Warsaw, the residence of the head of their family; and that such Frenchmen as continued to wear the orders and decorations belonging to the ancient Government of France should be directed to quit the British territories. But the First Consul had just reason to complain that Egypt was still occupied by the English troops though the French had evacuated that country more than fifteen months; that the Cape of Good Hope had not been restored to the Dutch, nor Malta to the Order of St. John, though the conditions for the restoration of that island had been fulfilled by the arrival of the Neapolitan garrison, and by the election of a Grand Master. All these were manifest infractions of the Treaty of Amiens, while France, on her side, had fulfilled the conditions of the treaty by withdrawing her troops from the Neapolitan dominions. The first two grievances were indeed removed before the discussions between France and England were concluded. Egypt was evacuated by the British troops, March 17th 1803, in order to avoid a rupture with Russia; and the Cape of Good Hope was restored to the Batavian Republic, February 21st. Malta, however, was still retained—a circumstance that might have afforded France a just reason for declaring war.

The war, however, was commenced by England. Tokens began to appear that a rupture was inevitable. George III. had sent a message to Parliament, March 8th, calling on them to enable him to adopt the measures necessary for supporting the honour of the Crown and the interests of the country, which were endangered by extensive preparations in the ports of France and Holland. Lord Whitworth had had several angry and unsatisfactory interviews with Bonaparte and Talleyrand. On March 14th, the First Consul, in one of those fits of blustering rage which he often assumed, insulted the English ambassador by his violence before the

diplomatic circle at the Tuileries. He is even said to have menaced Lord Whitworth with his cane; when the ambassador laid his hand on his sword with the determination of using it had he been struck. These angry negociations were terminated in May by a rupture. On the 10th of that month Lord Whitworth delivered the ultimatum of his Government, viz., that the King of Great Britain should retain possession of Malta for at least ten years, after which it should be abandoned to the inhabitants and recognised as an independent State; that France should not oppose the cession by the King of the Two Sicilies of the Isle of Lampedusa to Great Britain, as a naval station; that the territory of the Batavian Republic should be evacuated by the French troops within a month after the conclusion of a convention; that Great Britain should recognise the King of Etruria, and the Italian and Ligurian Republics; that Switzerland should be evacuated by the French troops; that a suitable territorial provision in Italy should be assigned to the King of Sardinia. The First Consul had consented that Malta should be held either by Austria, Russia, or Prussia, the three Powers that had guaranteed its independence; but this proposition was not acceptable to the English Cabinet.[19] The English ultimatum was refused; Lord Whitworth quitted Paris, May 12th, and General Andréossi, the French ambassador, was at the same time dismissed from London.

Hence it will appear that, so far as the stipulations of treaties are concerned, Great Britain was evidently in the wrong; the ultimatum of the English Cabinet proposing in fact a gross breach of the Treaty of Amiens. The war, therefore, can be justified only on general political reasons drawn from the aggressive ambition of the First Consul. The Addington Administration, one of the feeblest that ever governed England, had placed the country in a false position by concluding a treaty which could neither be executed without fatal consequences, nor broken without an apparent violation of public faith. The latter horn of this dilemma was, however, preferred. And how venial was this act in comparison with some of which Bonaparte had himself been guilty,

[19] The English Cabinet professed that it would accept the occupation of Russia, but asserted that that Power was not inclined to undertake it. Time, however, was not allowed to ascertain that fact; and, on the very day of the English ambassador's declaration, a letter arrived from the Emperor renewing the assurances of his guarantee of Malta, and tendering his mediation. See the *Rapport au Tribunat* of M. Daru, and the Special Commission respecting the negociations, May 23rd 1803, ap. Garden, t. viii. p. 172. This Report, drawn up with great ability, makes out a very strong case for France; which country, technically at least, must be allowed to have had the best of the argument.

who now complained of it so bitterly! It could not be doubted that the First Consul would seize every opportunity to aggrandise France without regard to right or justice; the mission of Sebastiani showed him still intent upon Egypt, and consequently upon the English possessions in the East; and, therefore, an immediate war, with possession of Malta, the best protection against such designs, appeared preferable to a future one without it. But what a vista of internecine struggle did such a determination open! The war was not undertaken for any specific object of policy. It was undertaken to put down a man who had rendered himself master of the most powerful and the most warlike nation of Europe; it might, therefore, have been evident from the first that it could not be terminated till the resources of one side or the other were exhausted; and, in fact, the sword was not sheathed till Bonaparte, after a struggle that lasted twelve years, was at length hurled from his throne.

On May 16th, an embargo was placed on all French and Dutch vessels in English harbours, and on the 18th appeared the English declaration of war. Bonaparte, at the same time, not only laid an embargo on English vessels, but also caused all English travellers in France, from the age of eighteen to sixty years, to be arrested on the pretext that they should serve as hostages for all Frenchmen that might be captured by the English on board French vessels navigating in ignorance of the rupture of the peace. In order to entrap them, Bonaparte had caused to be inserted in the *Argus* newspaper of May 10th, a paragraph in which the English who should remain in France after the departure of their ambassador were assured of protection.[20] To such small and perfidious arts could he descend to gratify his vengeance! By this cruel and tyrannical act some thousands of British subjects were, contrary to international law, detained at Verdun till the peace, separated from their families and friends, their homes and business. The English Government offered the Batavian Republic to respect its neutrality if the French troops were withdrawn from its territory. The Batavian Government solicited the First Consul to consent to this step; the only reply was an order for the arrest of all the English in Holland. This was executed, June 9th, and on the same day, Mr. Liston, the British minister, left the Hague. Thus the Batavian Republic became a belligerent, with the certain prospect of the loss of its colonies. A French army of 7000 men had entered Holland at the end of March. General Mortier took

[20] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 213.

the command of it in May, entered the county of Bentheim, under the sovereignty of George III. as Elector of Brunswick, on the 26th of that month, and continued his march towards Osnabrück and the Hanoverian Electorate. This invasion was a manifest violation of the neutrality of the Empire, as well as of international law; the Electorate being in no way connected with England, or involved in its quarrels, although governed by the same sovereign; but the Empire, weakened by intestine divisions, dared not to take any notice of the insult. The Hanoverian Government entered into a convention, at Suhlingen, with General Mortier, June 3rd,[21] by which the French troops were to occupy the Electorate; the Hanoverian troops were to retire beyond the Elbe, and not to bear arms against France or her allies during the present war. Hanover was treated as a conquered and subject country; the French general was to make what alterations he pleased in its administration; the French army was to be maintained, clothed, and mounted at its expense, and all its revenues were to be at the disposal of the French Government. On June 14th, Mortier committed a second violation of Imperial rights, by causing, without the slightest pretext whatsoever, Cuxhaven and Ritzebüttel to be occupied by his troops, places which belonged to the city of Hamburg. Talleyrand, in a note to Lord Hawkesbury, June 10th, announced that Hanover had been seized as a pledge for the evacuation of Malta; proposed to exchange the Hanoverian army against French prisoners, and stated that if the Convention of Suhlingen was not ratified, Hanover would be treated with all the rigour of war. Lord Hawkesbury, having replied that the King of Great Britain refused to identify himself in that capacity with the Elector of Hanover, and that he was resolved to appeal to the Empire, Mortier declared the Convention of Suhlingen null, and compelled Field-Marshal Walmoden, the Hanoverian commander, to sign a capitulation, July 5th,[22] by which he agreed to surrender all his arms, artillery, and horses, and to disband his troops. Mortier then took possession of the Duchy of Lunenburg; and thus the whole Electorate, with a population of a million souls, became the prey of the French. In vain the Hanoverian minister appealed to the Empire for aid, not a voice replied; in fact, the Empire no longer existed except in name. Masters of the Elbe, the French refused to allow any English merchandise to pass. England replied by blockading the mouths of the Elbe and Weser, causing a total stagnation of the commerce of North Germany.

[21] Martens, t. viii. p. 84.

[22] *Ibid.* p. 89.

The Emperor of Russia now offered his mediation on the base that the French should evacuate Holland, Switzerland, and all Italy, except Piedmont, and that the King of Sardinia should receive a sufficient indemnification; he also offered to occupy Malta for a certain period. The First Consul declined these conditions, and from this moment a coldness sprang up between the Cabinets of Paris and St. Petersburg. The King of Prussia also failed in an attempt to procure the evacuation of Hanover by the French.

The rupture between France and Great Britain entitled Bonaparte to demand the aid of Spain, agreeably to the treaty of alliance of August 15th 1796. But Spain had been alienated from the First Consul by the cession which she had been compelled to make of Trinidad, and by the sale of Louisiana to the United States of America. It will be remembered that at the peace of 1763, France had, by a secret treaty, ceded Louisiana to Spain; and that, after the battle of Marengo, Bonaparte had recovered that possession for France, by the secret treaty of St. Ildefonso, as one of the considerations for making the infant Duke of Parma King of Etruria.[23] But, though it does not appear in the treaty, Spain, in subsequent negociations, made it a condition of the cession that she should have the preference in case France, in her turn, should be disposed to cede Louisiana. The French Government had not taken regular possession of it when the war with England broke out; and Bonaparte hastened to sell that province to the Americans, who had already cast their eyes upon it, with the view both of preventing the English from ravishing it from him, and of procuring funds to carry on the war. By a convention with Mr. Monroe and Mr. Livingston, the American ministers at Paris, Bonaparte disposed of Louisiana to the United States for the net sum of sixty million francs.[24]

Piqued by these transactions, the Spanish Government attempted to elude their obligations towards France; while the First Consul, on his side, evinced a determination to enforce their discharge. An army of 30,000 men, under Augereau, was assembled in the neighbourhood of Bayonne, and Spain also increased her forces in the Pyrenees. An understanding was, however, effected, and a convention signed at Paris, October 19th 1803. Bonaparte preferred the Spaniards' money to their vessels or their troops; it suited him that Spain should remain neutral, as he could then make use of her ports, and enjoy her commerce without risking the loss of her colonies, which might prove an obstacle in concluding

[23] See above, p. 341.

[24] Garden, t. viii. p. 81.

a peace. By this convention Spain engaged to pay to France six million francs a month during the war, of which, however, two millions were to be retained on account of expenses in repairing and provisioning French ships in Spanish harbours, &c. France was to recognise the neutrality of Spain, and also of Portugal, that Power engaging to pay one million a month of the stipulated subsidy.[25] The sums payable by Spain under this treaty are computed at more than double the amount of her engagements under that of St. Ildefonso. Her refusal to communicate it to the Cabinet of London produced a war with Great Britain. The Regent of Portugal, after some resistance, was at length also compelled by the threats of Bonaparte to purchase his neutrality by the payment of twelve millions, or, according to some, sixteen millions a year (December 23rd 1803).

Among the first steps of Bonaparte after the breaking out of the war was the re-occupation of Naples. The troops that had been withdrawn had been kept on the frontiers of the Italian Republic and the Roman States, and towards the end of June they were again marched to the south under the command of General Gouvion St. Cyr. The feeble Government of Naples submitted to all the conditions exacted. But the First Consul's chief care was directed, or seemed to be directed, to an invasion of England. A great quantity of flat boats was assembled in all the ports of the Channel and the North Sea; a numerous army, called, by anticipation, the "Army of England," under Victor, Ney, Davoust, and Soult, was cantoned between the Texel and the mouth of the Seine, and was frequently visited by Bonaparte. These demonstrations excited a glowing spirit of patriotism in England. By August 10th, 300,000 volunteers are said to have enrolled themselves.[26] All the male population of the kingdom, from seventeen years of age to fifty-five, were divided into classes to be successively armed and exercised. The militia consisted of 84,000 men; the troops of the line of 96,000; and there were besides 25,000 troops destined for service at sea. The English fleet numbered 469 ships of war, and the coasts were guarded by a flotilla of 800 vessels. Attempts were made to destroy the vessels in the French harbours, and Havre, Granville, Dieppe, and Boulogne were bombarded, but with little result. The colonial operations of the English were more successful. The French and Dutch colonies of St. Lucie, St. Pierre, and Miquelon, Tobago, Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice were captured in a few

[25] Cantillo, p. 708; Garden, t. viii. p. 201 sqq. Cf. Gentz, *Verhältniss zwischen England und Spanien.*

[26] Knight's *Hist. of England*, vol. vii. p. 427.

months; General Rochambeau surrendered Cape Town in St. Domingo to Admiral Duckworth, November 30th, and all the French part of that island remained in the power of the negroes.

The year 1804 opened with a conspiracy for the overthrow of Bonaparte and the restoration of the Bourbons. The chief persons concerned in it in France were George Cadoudal, son of a miller in the Morbihan, and one of the most determined of the Chouans; General Pichegru, who had escaped from Guiana; General Moreau, and some members of the Polignac family. Although it does not appear that the assassination of Bonaparte was contemplated, it is, nevertheless, to be regretted that so base and underhand a mode of warfare should have been encouraged by members of the Addington Ministry, and promoted by their diplomatic agents abroad; as Mr. Drake, Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Spencer Smith, the English ministers at Munich, Hesse-Cassel, and Stuttgardt. The plot was discovered. Moreau was apprehended, February 15th; Pichegru on the 28th; George Cadoudal on March 9th. Several other conspirators were also arrested. It is said that Bonaparte was to have been seized by about 1200 Chouans, Vendeans, and other royalists, dressed in the uniform of the national guard; Moreau was to have addressed the troops of the line, with whom he was very popular; the Duke d'Enghien, grandson of the Prince de Condé, was then to be summoned to Paris; and it was expected that the Bourbons would be proclaimed without much resistance.[27] For this plot George Cadoudal and eighteen of his accomplices were executed. Pichegru was found strangled in his prison. Moreau's fate we shall record in the sequel. In his prosecution of this affair, Bonaparte compelled the Electors of Bavaria, Hesse-Cassel, and Baden to dismiss the English ministers from their courts; caused Wagstaff, an English Cabinet-messenger, to be stopped near Lubeck and robbed of his despatches, and Sir George Rumbold, the English minister at Hamburg, who was also implicated, to be seized on neutral ground and brought to Paris, where he would certainly have been shot by a military commission had not the King of Prussia interceded in his behalf.[28] Austria, which Power had greatly increased her forces in the Tyrol and in Suabia, was also suspected of being concerned in the plot. Napoleon, by threats of invasion, compelled the Emperor to reduce his armaments.

The discovery of this conspiracy made the First Consul more popular, and served to strengthen his grasp of power. This popularity was, however, lost among all right-thinking people, and

[27] Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 32.

[28] Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten. Jahrhts.* B. vi. S. 489; *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 378.

especially in foreign countries, by an atrocious crime which Bonaparte soon afterwards committed. The First Consul, not content with that dignity, had now resolved to seat himself on the throne of the Bourbons. He had even had the audacity, in the intoxication of his success, to demand from Louis XVIII. the cession in his favour of the rights of the House of Bourbon to the throne of France.[29] The asserted complicity of the Duke d'Enghien in the plot of Cadoudal, which appears to have had no foundation in truth, afforded him a pretext to get rid of one of the members of that House. The Duke was residing at Ettenheim, in the neutral territory of Baden, when Bonaparte, in violation of international law and the rights of the German Empire,[30] caused him to be seized on the night of March 15th by a party of French *gens d'armes* and to be carried to the Castle of Vincennes, where, after a sort of mock trial, he was shot in the fosse of the fortress, March 21st.

Numerous indications had gradually prepared the minds of men for the assumption of the crown by Napoleon. The Court of the Tuileries had put on all the aspect of royalty. Prefects of the Palace had been appointed to do its honours; when the First Consul drove out, his carriage was attended by an escort of cavalry with drawn sabres. The press had been subjected to a rigid censorship, while the journal which was supposed to convey the ideas of Bonaparte advocated the restoration of the monarchical principle, and incessantly attacked the philosophers, whose writings had contributed to the Revolution. The clergy gained fresh credit and power; even the Jesuits had ventured to reappear, under the name of *pères de la foi*.[31] George Cadoudal's plot hastened Bonaparte's last step towards absolutism. Men anxiously contemplated what would be the fate of France, if deprived of the firm hand which ruled it, and plunged again into anarchy. All who surrounded Bonaparte, his family, his friends, his ministers, urged him to establish his dynasty, and render it hereditary. At the instigation of Fouché, the servile Senate addressed the First

[29] Barante, *Lettres et Instructions de Louis XVIII au Comte de St. Priest*, Paris 1845. Cf. *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 317, and *Pièce Justificative*, G.

[30] Bonaparte, however, in his address to the Council of State on this horrible business, affirmed that he had the consent of the Elector of Baden. Talleyrand appears to have written to the minister of the Elector on the subject, March 11th; but there could hardly have been time to receive an answer. Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 34 sq.

The true motive of the murder of the Duke d'Enghien is said to have been a challenge addressed by that prince to Bonaparte, in concert with Gustavus IV. of Sweden, who proposed to act as the prince's second. The story rests on the authority of Gustavus himself, who after his abdication related it in Italy to an illustrious traveller. *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 290.

[31] Their establishments were, however, dissolved by an Imperial decree, June 23rd 1804. Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 128.

Consul, and vaguely demanded institutions which should destroy the hopes of conspirators, by assuring the existence of the Government beyond the lifetime of its head. Bonaparte, with well-acted surprise, assured the deputation, with equal vagueness, that he would consider the subject in the course of the year. When the senators had retired, he observed to some members of his Council of State: That not having been prepared for this demand, he could give only a vague answer, but the subject was worthy of the greatest attention; that for himself, he wanted nothing—he was content with his lot; but he was bound to think of France and her future interests; in any event, however, he would accept no new title without the sanction of the people.[32]

The deliberation of the legislative bodies on this subject was little more than a solemn farce. Bonaparte had half a million bayonets at his back. It was given out that he would visit all the camps, from Brest to Hanover; the soldiers, no doubt, would salute him Emperor, and their choice would be confirmed by the acclamations of the people. It was the interest of the legislature to anticipate what it could not oppose.[33] There was, however, more opposition in the Council of State than was pleasing to Bonaparte. He had hoped for unanimity; but seven members out of twenty-seven boldly supported, for the last time, the principles of republicanism. The Tribunate was more compliant. On May 3rd, it voted, almost unanimously, an hereditary empire. Carnot alone ventured to raise his voice against it. In a bold and vigorous discourse, he deplored the fall of the Republic, the ruin of liberty, and the re-establishment of monarchical institutions. But these sentiments found no echo; they were no longer understood. On April 23rd, Bonaparte invited the Senate to declare their opinion. His message was immediately taken into consideration; and he was desired to assume the empire with only four dissentient votes—those of Sieyès, Volney, Grégoire, and Lanjuinais. The *senatus-consulte* for regulating the new empire, which had been drawn up by Bonaparte himself, after several conferences with various members of the legislature, was immediately passed, May 18th 1804; and, on the same day, the Senate proceeded to St. Cloud, to present to the First Consul the act which declared him Emperor.

By this act the Imperial dignity was declared hereditary in Napoleon's male issue, by order of primogeniture. He might adopt the sons or grandsons of his brothers, in case he had himself

[32] Lefèbvre, *Cabinets de l'Europe*, ch. x.; Garden, t. viii. p. 214 sqq.

[33] Pelet de la Lozère, *Opinions de Napoléon*, p. 59 sqq.

no male issue at the time of the adoption; but the right of adoption was forbidden to his successors and their descendants. In default of heirs of Napoleon, the Imperial dignity was to devolve to his brother Joseph, and his descendants; in their default to his brother Louis, and his descendants. Napoleon had excluded his brothers Lucien and Jerome from the succession, in consequence of their having contracted marriages of which he disapproved; but he had promised to restore their rights, if they would dismiss their wives. The Council of State was instituted as an integral part and superior authority of the Empire. The fifty tribunes were suffered to remain for the present, as well as the legislative body of 300 members, who no longer represented the opinions and will of the nation.[34] The salaries of the senators and tribunes were considerably augmented. Several new Imperial dignities were created. The consul Cambacérès was appointed Arch-chancellor, the consul Lebrun, Arch-treasurer, Prince Joseph Bonaparte, Grand Elector, and Prince Louis, Constable. Eighteen of Napoleon's most distinguished generals were made Marshals of the Empire, viz., Berthier, Murat, Moncey, Jourdan, Masséna, Augereau, Bernadotte, Soult, Brune, Lannes, Mortier, Ney, Davoust, Bessières, Kellerman, Lefèbvre, Pérignon, Serrurier. Nearly all these men had been born in a very humble rank. Moreau, the greatest of Bonaparte's generals, as great perhaps as Bonaparte himself, though not so fortunate, but as timid a politician as he was a brave soldier, was now languishing in prison. The new Emperor of the French endeavoured to persuade the judges to condemn Moreau to death, in order that he might have the glory of pardoning him; but the majority of them were too honest and too courageous to obey. Moreau was sentenced to two years' imprisonment. Napoleon, dreading a military insurrection in Moreau's favour, offered him facilities of evasion, of which he would not avail himself. Eventually, a sort of composition was made with him, by which he consented to proceed, by way of Spain, to the United States.[35]

The Emperor Napoleon I. deemed two things still wanting to the confirmation of his new dignity—its ratification by the French people and its consecration by the Pope. As he had been already elected Consul for life, the question put to the people regarded not his elevation to the Imperial title, but whether the crown should be hereditary in his family. To this question 3,521,675 citizens out of 3,580,000 are said to have replied in the affirm-

[34] Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 101. [35] *Ibid.* p. 125.

ative.[36] Negociations were entered into with Pope Pius VII. to induce him to come to Paris and celebrate the coronation of the new Charlemagne.[37] The Pontiff consented to consecrate the usurper, whose hands were still red with the blood of the Duke d'Enghien, in the hope of playing a principal part in this solemnity and obtaining important advantages for the Romish Church; including the restitution, perhaps, of Bologna, Ferrara, and Ravenna. The ceremony took place at Notre Dame, December 2nd 1804. But the Pope was allowed only to anoint Napoleon and his Empress, to bless their robes and insignia, to lead the Imperial couple to their throne, and to conclude the solemnity with a prayer. Although Cardinal Fesch had promised Pius that he should crown the Emperor, Napoleon with his own hand put the crown on his own head and on that of Josephine; and after the coronation the Pope was left behind in the church like an ordinary assistant. His endeavours to recover the Legations proved also abortive. Several German princes visited Paris on this occasion; but only the Electoral Arch-chancellor had the honour of being invited to the Imperial table; the rest were obliged to content themselves with a side table, presided over by Joseph Bonaparte.[38]

Charles IV. of Spain, implicitly subservient to the counsels of the Prince of the Peace, now the devoted servant and instrument of France, displayed the coldest indifference at the murder of a prince of his House, and immediately recognised Napoleon's assumption of the Imperial title. Indignant at this conduct, the Count de Lille (Louis XVIII.) sent back to his royal relative the order of the Golden Fleece, accompanying the act with a bitter and appropriate reproof.[39]

With the exception of England, the only voice raised against the violence and aggressions of Napoleon came from the North. The Emperor Alexander alone ventured to remonstrate, as one of the guarantees of the Treaty of Lunéville, against the occupation of Hanover and Naples, and the closing of the Weser and the Elbe, as hurtful to the Hanseatic towns and German principalities, of which he declared himself the protector. Napoleon replied by treating Markoff, the Russian ambassador, with studied indignity. After the murder of the Duke d'Enghien, M. d'Oubril, the Russian *chargé d'affaires* at Paris (Markoff having been recalled) was instructed to express the Emperor's surprise and grief at that

[36] Lefèbvre, ch. x.

[37] The parallel was so striking that the Pope proposed December 25th, the anniversary of Charlemagne's coronation, for that of Napoleon. Lefèbvre, ch. x.

[38] Menzel, B. vi. S. 445 Anm.

[39] Lefèbvre, ch. xi.

event, and at the violation of the territory of Baden. The Russian minister at Ratisbon also handed in to the Diet, May 6th 1804,[40] a note in which the Empire was called upon in the most forcible manner to remonstrate with the French Government against the violation of its territory by an act of unparalleled violence, and to insist on such amends as the outraged dignity of the Empire and the maintenance of its future safety demanded. On the 12th of the same month M. d'Oubril delivered to the French Government an official note to the same effect.

Talleyrand, in reply, denied the right of Russia to interfere, and, accused the Cabinet of St. Petersburg of meditating a fresh Coalition, and the renewal of the war. He had also the indecency and bad taste to offend the Emperor, and at the same time to calumniate the English Government and the Duke d'Enghien by inquiring that, if when the English were concerting the assassination of Paul I., Alexander had been informed that his assassins were only a league from the Russian frontier, would he not have felt it his duty to arrest them? The Russian *chargé d'affaires* was reprimanded by his Court for accepting this note; and on July 12th he delivered the Russian *ultimatum*: that the French troops should evacuate the Kingdom of Naples; that the French Government should immediately establish, in concert with Russia, a basis for regulating the affairs of Italy; that it should engage to indemnify the King of Sardinia without delay; that it should at once withdraw its troops from the North of Germany, and engage strictly to respect the neutrality of the German Confederation. Talleyrand replied in a haughty note dictated to him by Napoleon from Boulogne, in which the Russian demands were evaded; and the Russian minister, after answering with dignity and moderation, and recapitulating all the complaints of his sovereign against France, quitted Paris with all the Legation, August 31st 1804. The Emperor Alexander manifested his indignation at the murder of the Duke d'Enghien by causing a monument to be erected to his memory in the principal church of St. Petersburg, with a Latin inscription purporting that "he had been cruelly murdered by the Corsican brute."[41]

Sweden alone joined Russia in these remonstrances and complaints. Gustavus IV. was accidentally in the dominions of the Elector of Baden when the crime against the Duke d'Enghien was committed almost under his eyes. The Swedish minister at Paris presented a note against that violation of the German territory,

[40] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 347.

[41] "Quem Corsica bellua immaniter trucidavit." Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 41.

May 14th. A violent attack upon the King of Sweden, published in the French official journal, the *Moniteur*, August 14th, determined Gustavus to recall his legation from Paris. The French *chargé d'affaires* at Stockholm, in a note of September 7th, in which the French Emperor was qualified only as Monsr. Napoléon Bonaparte, was informed that all diplomatic intercourse must cease between the two countries.[42] The German sovereigns displayed their usual subservience to Napoleon. The King of Prussia was silent about the fate of the Duke d'Enghien and the violation of the German territory till May 1806, when events suddenly recalled these matters to his memory. He had hastened to recognise Napoleon as Emperor of the French;[43] whereupon the Count de Lille retired from Warsaw to the Russian town of Grodno. Here he employed himself in drawing up a protest against Napoleon's usurpation; but Alexander would not suffer such an act in his dominions, and the French King, or, as he was now called, "the Pretender," embarked for Sweden and published his protest at Calmar.[44] The Emperor Francis II. had winked at the murder of the Duke d'Enghien. The Austrian ambassador at Paris, Count Philip Cobentzl, had declared in the presence of the First Consul that there were circumstances which obliged a government to take measures for its safety which other governments should abstain from judging. In fact, Austria herself had sometimes resorted to such "measures." When the Emperor Alexander brought the subject before the German Diet, Austria joined Prussia in obtaining its suppression.[45] Francis II. did not recognise Napoleon's new dignity without some stipulations for his own interest. As his dignity of Emperor of Germany was elective, it might one day happen, through Protestant and foreign influence, that the House of Austria might be deprived of it, when the reigning prince, being only Archduke of Austria and King of Bohemia and Hungary, would find himself inferior in rank to the Emperors of France and Russia. It was therefore decided by the Cabinet of Vienna that Francis should immediately assume the title of hereditary EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA; and negociations were entered into with Napoleon for the reciprocal acknowledgment of the new titles. Napoleon insisted upon being first recognised; and when that had been done, Francis proclaimed himself hereditary Emperor of Austria, August 11th 1804.[46]

[42] Garden, t. viii. p. 274.
[43] By a letter dated May 27th 1804.
[44] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 402.
[45] Lefèbvre, *Hist. des Cabinets*, ch. ix.
[46] Lefèbvre, *Hist. des Cabinets*, ch. x. As Emperor of Austria, he was of course Francis I.

The breach of Russia and Sweden with France offered the elements of a new Coalition, which Pitt, who had returned to power in May 1804, on the resignation of Mr. Addington, made it a principal object of his policy to establish. But before that could be effected, another enemy had entered the lists against England. The Treaty of St. Ildefonso, between France and Spain, confirmed, though modified, by that of October 19th 1803, being offensive, or, as the publicists call it, a *partnership of war*, would justify Great Britain in treating Spain as an enemy. But there remained the question of policy. Negociations, which it would be too long here to record,[47] were entered into with the Cabinet of Madrid, with the view of inducing it to remain neutral, or, at all events, to afford but a feeble and ostensible aid to France. But, meanwhile, it was discovered in September 1804, that large naval expeditions, consisting of French vessels, were preparing in the ports of Ferrol, Cadiz, and Carthagena; and as Spain was not at war with any other country, the only inference could be that they were destined against England. Orders were consequently given for a strict blockade of Ferrol, and British commanders were enjoined to stop and bring into port all Spanish vessels laden with warlike stores. Great Britain had always been accustomed to commence hostilities without a formal declaration of war. How far this practice may be conformable to the Law of Nations[48] it is unnecessary here to examine, as in the present case the English Government had long announced to the Court of Madrid that it claimed the right of hostilities without a previous declaration of war, if the conditions were infringed on which a suspension of them had been granted; and the armament at Ferrol was regarded as such an infringement. The Spanish minister, indeed, pretended that it was destined for Bilbao, to put down an insurrection in Biscay; but this was evidently false and absurd, as the port of Bilbao will not even admit a frigate, much less a ship of the line. The Cabinet of Madrid was evidently seeking only to gain time for the arrival of the treasure-ships.[49]

In consequence of the orders issued by the English Government, Captain Moore, with a squadron of four English frigates, captured, October 5th, near Cape St. Mary's, three Spanish frigates from La Plata, having on board about 240,000*l.* sterling, in money, and many valuable effects. Another frigate blew up, and sunk with all her crew. The English Government declared this treasure

[47] See for them Gentz, *Authentische Darstellung des Verhältnisses zwischen England und Spanien.*

[48] On this point see Garden, *Traité de Diplomatie*, t. ii. p. 255, Wheaton.

[49] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 392.

sequestrated, by way of securing English merchants having credits in Spain. In spite of this affair, attempts were made to preserve neutrality with Spain; but as the Cabinet of Madrid would not explain the nature of its engagements with France, and of the preparations in its ports, Mr. Frere, the English minister, quitted Madrid, November 7th. Orders were given to commence hostilities against Great Britain towards the end of that month: a Spanish manifesto appeared December 12th, and was answered by Great Britain January 25th 1805.

The warlike operations of the year 1804, which were only maritime, were not of much importance. In Europe they were confined to Napoleon's preparations for invading England, and the attempts of the English to frustrate and destroy them. The French and Dutch coasts were observed by Lord Cornwallis and Sir Sidney Smith, while Nelson blockaded Toulon and Genoa and observed the other ports of the Mediterranean. The French flotilla having been collected in large numbers in Boulogne harbour, an attempt was made early in October, under the conduct of Lord Keith, to destroy it by means of fire-ships, and by machines called *catamarans*, consisting of copper vessels filled with combustibles, which were to be stealthily affixed in the darkness of night to the bottoms of the enemy's vessels, and exploded by means of clock-work. But this scheme utterly failed and covered its projectors with ridicule. In the West Indies, the important Dutch colony of Surinam was reduced by Commodore Hood and General Green, April 29th. In the East, Admiral Linois with a small French squadron infested English commerce from his station in the Isle of France.

Meanwhile Napoleon was sensible that Pitt was preparing against him another Coalition, although as yet he had no positive proof of the concert between the Cabinets of London, Vienna, and St. Petersburg. By way of counterpoise, he endeavoured to effect an intimate alliance with the King of Prussia; and he tempted Frederick William III., but without success, by offering to support him in extending his dominions and assuming the title of Emperor.[50] The substitution of Hardenberg[51] for Haugwitz at this time, in the Cabinet of Berlin, effected through the influence of the Queen, was adverse to Napoleon's policy. The King of Prussia was also courted at this juncture by the Emperor Alexander. We have already alluded to the friendship which had sprung up between those two monarchs, and the occupation of Hanover by the French had served to draw it closer. Frederick William, alarmed by that step, and by the

[50] Lefèbvre, ch. xi.

[51] The statesman from whose papers were compiled the *Mémoires d'un homme d'état*; which we have so frequently cited.

arming of the Swedes, which threatened to render North Germany the theatre of war, had entered into a secret convention with the Emperor Alexander, May 24th 1804, which stipulated that if the number of the French troops in the Hanoverian Electorate should be increased beyond 30,000, or if any other German State should be invaded, they should unite their forces to oppose it: and the Emperor, in this case, put all the forces of his Empire at the disposal of Prussia.[52] But Frederick William III. was sincerely desirous of preserving both the peace of Europe and his own neutrality; and in order to heal the misunderstanding which had grown up between France and Russia he offered his mediation. He proposed a plan, which, though accepted with some reservation by Napoleon, was at once rejected by Alexander. The latter sovereign demanded the entire fulfilment by France of the Convention of October 11th 1801, and especially with regard to the affairs of Italy.[53] His insisting on a point which, while it did not much concern himself, was of vital importance to Austria, confirmed Napoleon in his suspicions of a secret understanding between Austria and Russia. Francis II. had in fact concluded with Alexander a secret convention, November 6th 1804, which was to have the same effect for the south of Europe as the convention with Prussia for the north. If France committed new usurpations in Italy, extended her occupation in Naples beyond the Gulf of Taranto, effected further annexations in Italy, or threatened Egypt or any part of the Turkish Empire, Austria was to resist with an army of 150,000 men. For this service, if the allied arms were successful, Austria was to have the district as far as the Adda and the Po; the Dukes of Tuscany and Modena were to be restored to their dominions; and Salzburg and the Breisgau, thus vacated, were to revert to the Emperor. The House of Savoy was to be re-established in Piedmont, Genoa, and the Milanese.[54]

Although Napoleon had no certain knowledge of this treaty, observation had convinced him that the continental peace could not much longer be preserved. Under this apprehension, he addressed another letter to "his brother," King George III., January 2nd 1805,[55] conceived in much the same style of interrogative objurgation as the former one; in which he invoked a peace in the name of "humanity and reason:" qualities to which, when hard pressed, he was always inclined to pay due honour.[56] Lord Mulgrave, now

[52] This Convention, first published by M. Thiers, in his *Hist. du Consulat et de l'Empire*, t. v. p. 25, will also be found in Garden, t. viii. p. 385.

[53] Lefèbvre, ch. xi.

[54] Also first published by M. Thiers, *Ibid.* p. 355. It is in Garden, t. viii. p. 397 sqq.

[55] *Corr. de Nap. I.*, t. x. p. 100.

[56] Some, however, are of opinion that

foreign secretary, in his answer of January 14th, addressed to Talleyrand, shortly observed that nothing could be done except in concert with the continental Powers, and particularly Russia. The speech of George III. on opening Parliament the following day, was couched in terms which showed little hope of a pacification.[57] But if any doubt existed, it must have been removed a few days after (February 18th) by Mr. Pitt's motion for a grant of five millions for continental purposes.

The English Ministry, in fact, doubted not of their ability to establish a formidable Coalition against France. A treaty was first concluded with Gustavus IV. of Sweden, December 3rd 1804, by which Great Britain engaged to pay that monarch 80,000*l.* for the defence of Stralsund, Gustavus permitting that place, or the Isle of Rügen, to be a depôt for a Hanoverian corps which the King of Great Britain proposed to form: also that Stralsund should be an *entrepôt* for British merchandise and manufactures. The French Government having obtained knowledge of this treaty, employed the King of Prussia to threaten Sweden; whereupon Gustavus appealed to the Emperor of Russia, with whom he had concluded an intimate alliance, January 14th 1805, with the expressed view "of maintaining the balance between the Powers of Europe, and guaranteeing the independence of Germany." At the instance of Alexander, Frederick William III. desisted from his threats against Sweden; but a coldness sprang up; the Prussian minister quitted Stockholm May 29th 1805, and all communication between the two Powers entirely ceased.

But the true foundation of the Third Coalition was laid in a communication from the British Government to M. Novosiltzof, the Russian ambassador at London, January 19th 1805.[58] The genius of Pitt, disdaining the meaner arts of his predecessor, had planned a scheme of warfare on a scale worthy of England, of the adversary with whom she had to cope, and of the vast European interests at stake. The objects of this gigantic project were—1. To wrest from the domination of France the countries which she had subjugated since the commencement of the Revolution, and to reduce her within her previous limits; 2. To make such arrangements with regard to these countries as might insure their peace and welfare, and at the same time render them barriers against the future aggressions of France; 3. To conclude, after the restoration

Napoleon was not in earnest, and that his object only was to obtain an indirect acknowledgment of his new title. *Hamme d'état*, t. viii. p. 420.

[57] *Annual Register*, 1805, State Papers, p. 605.

[58] It will be found *in extenso* in Garden, t. viii. p. 318 sqq.

of peace, a convention and guarantee for the mutual surety of the different Powers, and to establish in Europe a general system of public law. The English Cabinet felt that it was impossible to carry out these views, as a whole, without the co-operation of Austria and Prussia. Of the aid of the latter Power little hope was entertained; and the want of it, as Pitt had apprehended, caused the failure of the Coalition. In fact, had a Prussian army operated on the left wing of the French in the campaign of 1805, it would in all probability have been impossible for Napoleon to advance into the Austrian dominions. Both Prussia and Austria were to be induced to join the league by holding out to them the hope, in case of success, of some material rewards for their co-operation. Prussia was to have the territories wrested from France on the left bank of the Rhine, while Austria was to be rewarded with an extension of her dominions in Italy, and by the re-establishment of the Grand Duke of Tuscany and the Duke of Modena in that country; when the districts which had been assigned to those princes in Germany, by way of compensation, would revert to Austria.

The Emperor Alexander entered heartily and readily into the English scheme, and on April 11th 1805, a treaty of alliance was concluded at St. Petersburg.[59] The general object of the contracting Powers in this *treaty of concert* was stated to be, to form a general league of the European States, so that a force of 500,000 effective men should be collected, independently of those furnished by the King of Great Britain. The more specific ends to be obtained were: the evacuation by the French of Hanover and North Germany; the establishment of the independence of Holland and Switzerland; the restoration of the King of Sardinia in Piedmont, with as large a territory as circumstances might permit; the evacuation of Italy, and the future safety of the Kingdom of Naples; the establishment of such an order of things in Europe as might effectually guarantee the safety and independence of the different States, and present a solid barrier against further usurpations. Great Britain engaged to contribute to the common efforts with her land and sea forces, by providing transports, and by paying subsidies at the rate of 1,250,000*l.* sterling for every 100,000 regular troops furnished. For this purpose Pitt had demanded five millions from Parliament, afterwards, on the refusal of Prussia to join the league, reduced to three-and-a-half millions. No peace was to be made without the consent of all the parties to the league. The treaty contained eleven or twelve additional articles, about

[59] The treaty is given only imperfectly by Martens, t. viii. p. 330. See Garden, t. viii. p. 327. *Ann. Register*, 1806.

half of which have remained secret. The most remarkable conditions of the articles that are known are: that active operations should commence when a force of 400,000 men was assembled; of which, 250,000 were to be furnished by Austria, 115,000 by Russia, besides levies in Albania, &c.; and the rest were to be composed of Hanoverians, Neapolitans, Sardinians, &c. Certain general principles of justice and international law were to be recognised in the mode of proceeding. Thus neither France nor other countries were to be coerced with regard to their internal government; no conquests were to be appropriated before the peace; at the conclusion of the war a general Congress was to be assembled to fix with more precision the principles of the Law of Nations, and to insure their observation by a federative system formed with reference to the situation of the different European States.

The principles laid down by Pitt in these negociations with Russia were, after ten more years of war and desolation, ultimately carried out in their main outlines in 1814; and the shade of the great English Minister may be said to have presided over the deliberations of Vienna. Austria did not deem it politic at once to join the league. There could, however, be no doubt of her ultimate co-operation, and she was consulted respecting the plan of the campaign. The King of Prussia resisted alike the enticements and the menaces of Russia. His situation at this time offered the greatest opportunities, though accompanied no doubt with dangers. Courted by both sides, he might probably have aggrandised himself by joining either, or if he preferred the dictates of equity to those of ambition, he might, as an armed mediator, have compelled a peace. But Frederick William III. inherited no portion of the spirit of the great Frederick. He followed none of these courses. He thought only of securing his neutrality, and adopted the apparently safe, but, as it proved, fatal policy of doing nothing.

While the storm was thus gathering over Napoleon's head he was ardently pursuing the schemes of his insatiable ambition. On March 15th 1805, a deputation of the Italian Republic, which he had summoned from Milan, offered to him the crown of Italy. The separation of the crowns of France and Italy—for both were to be united only during the life of Napoleon, though he was to have the power of nominating his successors—seemed to sanction a principle necessary to the repose of Europe; yet as the dignity of King of Italy had been attached since the days of Otho the Great to the imperial crown of Germany,[60] Napoleon was aware

[60] Otho, after his conquest of Italy in 961, caused himself to be crowned King of that country, and claimed the exercise of an unlimited sovereignty. Hence Otho

that he could not, without offending the House of Austria, assume a title by which the elective Kings of the Romans were regarded as the first sovereigns and secular heads of Christendom. Such considerations, however, were of little weight with him. On March 18th he declared to the French senate that he had accepted the Lombard crown, in order, as he observed, to strengthen it against those tempests which would not cease to menace it till the Mediterranean should have been restored to its natural conditions. He set off for Milan early in May, and was of course received in that city "with incredible transports of joy and enthusiasm."[61] On May 26th he crowned himself with the iron crown of the old Lombard kings; pronouncing at the same time the accustomed words, to which the circumstances of the time gave an additionally solemn and formidable character: *Dio me la diede; guai a chi la tocca.*[62]

A singular scene took place a few days after Napoleon's coronation. Queen Caroline of Naples, who, with the minister Acton, governed that country, had incurred the Emperor's anger by her warlike preparations, and had been compelled by his threats to abandon them. Caroline, nevertheless, subordinating pride to policy, sent Prince Cardito to Milan to compliment Napoleon on his new title. The ambassador delivered his felicitations in the midst of a brilliant circle. Scarce had he finished his speech when the Emperor, giving free vent to one of his violent explosions of passion, denounced the intrigues of Queen Caroline, her hatred of France, and her endeavours to excite against him the Northern Courts: reproached her with the blood which she had caused to be shed at Naples in 1799, compared her with the daughter of Jezebel, stigmatised her with the name of the modern Athaliah, and swore that he would not leave her ground enough for a grave. The courtiers gazed in mute surprise on so unaccustomed a scene. But though Napoleon's invectives turned only on the policy of the Queen, the real cause of his anger was a domestic insult. He had proposed a marriage between his step-son, Eugene Beauharnais, and one of the Neapolitan princesses; but the daughter of Maria Theresa had haughtily rejected an alliance so incompatible with her illustrious descent.[63] Napoleon was deeply wounded by this refusal. He had a fatherly affection for the son of Josephine, whom he appointed viceroy of the new Italian kingdom. In this

called it his *regnum proprium*. Pfeffel, t. i. p. 128, 176, &c.

[61] Lefèbvre, ch. xii.

[62] "God gave it to me; woe to him who touches it."

[63] Lefèbvre, ch. xii.

capacity Eugene Beauharnais was the mere executor of his adoptive father's wishes.

Napoleon ruled Italy with a rod of iron. Making no allowance for habits and customs, he enforced in Lombardy the same regulations which he had made for France; nay, he even caused the *Code Napoléon* to be literally translated into Italian, and ordered it to be adopted and executed; a thing utterly impossible, as many of its provisions referred to customs which existed not in Italy.[64] Napoleon alone convoked and adjourned the Legislative Assembly, ordered all public works, appointed to all civil and military employments. A small state of four million souls, which had been less taxed than any other in Europe, was compelled to pay him near seventy-seven million francs, besides twenty-five millions for the support of a French army in Italy: to which, also, it was compelled to furnish conscripts. These oppressions naturally engendered a spirit of revolt. The little town of Crespino having betrayed some Austrian tendencies, Napoleon placed it under martial law, doubled its contributions, increased the rigour of its penal code; and when the viceroy solicited its pardon, replied: "My son, I must have blood to wash out the stain upon my colours. Direct four or five of the principal inhabitants to be seized and shot in the public square; after this execution I may perhaps forgive the rest the punishment they have incurred."[65] Before Napoleon left Milan Genoa and the Ligurian Republic were incorporated with France, June 3rd 1805. This was the fourth Republic which, contrary to the Treaty of Lunéville, he kept under his domination or subjected to his crown. The Duchies of Parma and Piacenza, which, together with Guastalla, had been already seized, were declared dependencies of the French Empire by an imperial decree of July 21st. The principality of Piombino was bestowed on Napoleon's sister Eliza, wife of the Senator Bacciocchi, but on conditions which retained it under the Emperor's suzerainty: and the little state was increased by the addition of the Republic of Lucca.

Napoleon, the better to conceal his designs upon England, had remained at Milan till late in the summer; when, thinking the time come that Villeneuve might join him with the French fleet to cover the invasion, he quitted Milan secretly, and traversing the Alps and France with the greatest celerity, suddenly appeared in the camp at Boulogne on the night of August 2nd. The army of invasion numbered 167,000 well disciplined troops. But

[64] *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 428. [65] *Ibid.* p. 431.

Napoleon found it not so easy to direct the operations of a fleet as the manœuvres of an army. Villeneuve, escaping from the blockade of Toulon, and accompanied by the Spanish admiral Gravina from Cadiz, had proceeded in April to the West Indies in order to deceive Nelson and the other English admirals as to his real intentions. But on his return to Europe, he was encountered off Cape Finisterre by the English fleet under Sir Robert Calder. An action ensued July 22nd, in which the English captured two Spanish line-of-battle ships. On the following day the hostile fleets were still in sight, but neither seemed disposed to renew the combat, although the French admiral bore up several times in order of battle; after which he proceeded to Ferrol. The English were now accustomed to regard victory at sea so much as a matter of course, that Sir R. Calder, though his fleet was considerably inferior in force to that of the enemy, consisting of only fifteen ships of the line against twenty Spaniards and Frenchmen, was subsequently brought before a court-martial and severely reprimanded. In spite of the imperative instructions of Napoleon to proceed immediately to the English Channel, Villeneuve consumed eleven days in revictualling at Ferrol. He at length came out, August 13th; but the English fleet being reported, retreated to Cadiz with thirty-three sail of the line; where he was blockaded by Sir R. Calder, now joined by Collingwood, with twenty-five. Thus vanished all Napoleon's hopes of commanding the Channel. Meanwhile the hostile intentions of Austria had become apparent, and Napoleon was compelled to abandon his scheme of invading England, to turn against another enemy. Francis II., who had long been increasing his forces in Italy and Germany, formally acceded, August 9th 1805, to the Anglo-Russian treaty of April 11th, and thus completed the formation of the Third Coalition. After some negociation, the English Cabinet had agreed to pay Austria a subsidy of three millions for the year 1805, and four millions for every subsequent year that the war might last. On August 28th appeared an ordinance, putting the Austrian army on a war footing. Nevertheless Francis II., who had even had the duplicity to offer his mediation with England and Russia, still continued in September to assure the French Government of his pacific intentions. The Austrian Cabinet wanted to gain time to complete their preparations; but their notes soon assumed a tone which Napoleon could only regard as a declaration of war.

CHAPTER XII.

NAPOLEON did not abandon all hope of the appearance of his fleet till August 28th, when, hearing that Villeneuve had put into Cadiz, and also that the Austrians were in motion, he issued orders for raising the camps upon the coast. The troops were directed towards the Rhine in four divisions, under Davoust, Soult, Lannes, and Ney, with orders to be in position between Strasburg and Mentz before the end of September. At the same time the army of Holland, under Marmont, also marched towards Mentz; and that of Hanover, under Bernadotte, was put in motion, but its destination was concealed, in order to deceive the King of Prussia, in case of the failure of the negociations which were still in progress. The allied Powers had formed a plan to frighten the timorous Frederick William III. out of his neutrality. A Russian army was to advance to the frontiers of Prussian Poland, to force them if necessary, and to advance through Silesia towards the Danube. Another army, composed of 45,000 English, Swedes, and Russians, was to land in Swedish Pomerania and at the mouth of the Weser, and thence to make an irruption into Hanover. The allies hoped that, Prussia being thus surrounded with a network of troops, Frederick William, as well from fear as from a secret sympathy with their cause, would be induced to join the Coalition. To oppose these designs, Napoleon, who knew that the King of Prussia had long coveted Hanover, proposed to him, through the French Ambassador, M. de la Forest, to deliver over to him that electorate, to be incorporated in the Prussian dominions, as the price of his alliance with France. The proposition was supported by Hardenberg. To the King's scruples at robbing the House of Brunswick Lüneburg, his relatives, Hardenberg replied, that the morality of a sovereign resembled not that of an individual; that the operation was one calculated to place his monarchy in the rank it ought to occupy in the world, as well as to allay the storm that menaced the Continent, and to force England to a peace.[1] Frederick William, yielding to these

[1] This is Lefèbvre's account. In the *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 466 sq, the matter is softened down; but enough remains to show that the statement is substantially correct.

arguments, notified his assent to the French proposal, but on condition that France should engage to respect the independence of Switzerland, Holland, and those states of the Italian Peninsula which belonged not to the French Empire nor to the Kingdom of Italy. Encouraged by this progress, Napoleon despatched Duroc, the Grand-Marshal of his palace, to Berlin, to bring the negociations to a conclusion; without, however, consenting to the conditions respecting Italy, and the Swiss and Batavian Republics. But before Duroc could arrive, the timorous Frederick William had changed his mind. The hope of preserving the peace of Europe had induced him, as much as the acquisition of Hanover, to listen to Napoleon's offer; and meanwhile he had discovered that war was inevitable. The allies had also worked on his fears, by representing to him the gigantic projects of ambition entertained by the French Emperor, and their representations were supported by the Queen of Prussia, as well as by the greater part of Frederick William's court. After an attempt at mediation, the last decision of Frederick William was for a strict neutrality; but in this he was firm as well as sincere. The Emperor Alexander, in pursuance of the plan already mentioned, marched an army towards the Prussian frontiers; requested that it should be permitted to pass through the Prussian dominions towards the Inn; as well as a personal interview with Frederick William. M. Alopéus, the Emperor's minister at Berlin, even went so far as to name the day when the Russian troops would cross the frontiers of Prussia. But this insult filled Frederick William with all the energy of anger. He immediately ordered an extraordinary levy of 80,000 men. At the same time France was informed that the King of Prussia would sign an alliance with her on the slightest infraction of his neutrality by Russia; while the Emperor Alexander received a similar assurance in case of an aggression on Prussia by France. Such was the position of the Prussian monarchy when the campaign opened on the Danube.[2]

The operations of the Coalition were conceived on an immense scale; they embraced Germany and Italy, and extended from the mouth of the Weser to the Gulf of Taranto. Austria was ready to enter upon the campaign early in September. Her army in Italy, commanded by the Archduke Charles, consisted of 120,000 men; a second of 35,000, under the Archduke John, was posted in the Tyrol; a third, in Germany, of about 80,000 men, was nominally commanded by the Archduke Ferdinand, a cousin of the Emperor,

[2] For these negociations with Prussia, see Lefèbvre, ch. xiii.

but in reality by General Mack. The appointment of this incompetent, but plausible, person, seems to have been effected through the influence of the English Cabinet, in spite of his signal, nay almost ludicrous failure in Italy.[3] Mack had been condemned by the two greatest captains of the age, Bonaparte and Nelson. Mack, after his capture in Italy, had been brought to Paris, where Napoleon made his acquaintance, and pronounced him the most mediocre personage he had ever known.[4] Nelson, who saw him at Naples, had also judged and condemned him.[5] On this occasion, his incompetence was to decide the fate of empires.

An army of Russians and Swedes was to operate in North Germany; while two Russian armies of about 60,000 men each, under the orders of Kutusoff and Buxhovden, were to march through Gallicia, and join Mack on the Upper Danube. Russian troops from the Ionian Islands, combined with some English detachments from Malta, were to land in the Neapolitan dominions, drive out the French, and assist the operations of the Austrians in Northern Italy. But, in order to frustrate this plan, as well as to assume the appearance of having removed one of the obstacles to peace, and, at the same time, to be enabled to employ his troops in Southern Italy against the Archduke Charles, Napoleon concluded at Paris a convention with the Marquis de Gallo, September 21st 1805, by which the French troops were to evacuate the kingdom of Naples; Ferdinand IV. undertaking, on his side, to observe a strict neutrality, to repel by force any attempt to violate it, and to permit no belligerent squadron to enter his ports.[6] This convention was very distasteful to the Court of Naples; but the dread of immediate hostilities compelled Ferdinand to ratify it, October 9th.

It was of the highest importance to the success of the campaign in Germany, that Austria should assure herself of the co-operation of the Electors of Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden. It was impossible for those princes, from the situation of their dominions between the contending Powers, to remain neutral. They were known to be inclined towards Napoleon, by whom, as we have seen, they had been highly favoured in the matter of the indemnifications; and the only method by which Austria could hope to insure their aid, was to compel it by a sudden invasion. Instead of this, the Cabinet of Vienna attempted to conciliate the employment of force with the observance of forms. On September 6th,

[3] See above, p. 314.
[4] Bourienne, *Mém.*, t. iii. ch. 8.
[5] In a letter to Lord Spencer, November 9th 1795.
[6] Garden, t. viii. p. 365 sq.

Prince Schwarzenberg arrived in Munich with a letter from the Emperor Francis, beseeching Maximilian Joseph to unite his arms with those of Austria, and guaranteeing to him the integrity of his dominions, whatever might be the event of the war. The Elector, after giving a ready assent to this request, addressed on the following day a letter to the Emperor Francis, in which he stated that his son, the electoral prince, was in France; that he would be lost if the Bavarian troops were to march against Napoleon; and he, therefore, supplicated his Imperial Majesty to be allowed to maintain his neutrality. In fact, however, Maximilian Joseph had already signed the preliminaries of an alliance with Napoleon, August 24th; and actuated by the fear of being crushed between two such Powers, he wrote an abject letter, September 8th, to M. Otto, the French minister at Munich, stating what he had done, and deprecating the anger of Napoleon. M. Otto, perceiving that the Elector was about to secede, hastened to the palace, and, partly by threats, partly by painting to him in vivid colours the ignominy of his situation if he remained a day longer at Munich, he, with the aid of the minister Mongelas, persuaded Maximilian to set off with his court that very night for Würtzburg; where he would be protected by the advancing French columns. The Bavarian troops, 26,000 in number, followed by forced marches.

The day after the Elector's flight, and when it was no longer possible to secure him, the Austrian army crossed the Inn, and entered Bavaria (September 9th). Thus deprived of the co-operation of the Bavarians, Mack should have awaited in that electorate the arrival of the Russian army under Kutusoff, which was still at a great distance. Instead of doing so, he traversed Bavaria, entered Suabia, and took up a position on the Iller, between Ulm and Memmingen, occupied the defiles of the Black Forest, and pushed the heads of his columns as far as Stockach; thus throwing himself into the jaws of his formidable enemy, and separating himself more and more from the Russians. Unfortunately for Mack, Napoleon in person had undertaken the German campaign, with the greater part of his forces; while the Austrian Cabinet, thinking that Italy would be the chief point of attack, had posted their best general and their largest army in that country. Napoleon, after appearing at Paris in the Senate, September 23rd, set off to join his army. He had formed a plan to surprise and overwhelm Mack on the Upper Danube, with all his forces, and to cut him off from the Russians and from Vienna. The French army destined to operate in Germany consisted of 190,000 men. Besides the four divisions already mentioned, and

those of Marmont and Bernadotte in Holland and Hanover, a seventh corps, from Brest, with the guard and reserves of cavalry, was directed on Haguenau, Strasburg, and Schelestadt. The success of Napoleon's plan depended on the precision with which the movements of the different corps were executed. Davoust passed the Rhine at Mannheim, September 26th, and directed his march on Oettingen. Soult and Ney also passed the Rhine on the 26th, the first at Spires, the second at Karlsruhe, and made for Donauwerth and Dillingen. Bernadotte in Hanover, Marmont in Holland, were both to direct their march on Würtzburg; the former by Göttingen, the latter by Utrecht and Mentz. Thus, while Mack was expecting an attack in front, nearly the whole French army was "*pivoting*" on his right, and manœuvring to cross the Danube in his rear. Napoleon, to keep up his delusion, ordered a false attack in front. Lannes, with his division, and Murat, with 7000 cavalry, having passed the Rhine, September 27th, marched straight forwards towards Reuchen and Hornberg, as if they would force the defiles of the Black Forest. Napoleon having joined this division, October 1st, directed its march upon Stuttgardt. Here he signed a treaty of alliance with the Elector of Würtemberg, October 3rd, who agreed to furnish 8000 men during the war. Napoleon now made some false demonstrations and manœuvres, to conceal from the enemy the march of his columns upon Donauwerth. Marmont's and Bernadotte's divisions had already arrived at Würtzburg. From this place the Elector of Bavaria had sent a declaration to the Emperor Francis II., September 21st, that he had determined to remain neutral, and that all the menaces of France should not make him abandon this unalterable resolution. Yet in less than a fortnight after these solemn assurances, the Bavarians joined Bernadotte and Marmont immediately on their appearance, October 2nd; and on the 12th, the Elector ratified the provisional treaty with France of August 24th.[7]

Bernadotte, by the junction of Marmont's division and the Bavarians, finding himself at the head of 60,000 men, directed his march towards the Danube. The union of so large a force at Würtzburg should have opened Mack's eyes; but he imagined that Bernadotte was stationed there to watch the Prussians, and he did not begin to perceive that marshal's real intentions till he arrived at Eichstädt and Donauwerth. The direct road between

[7] For the preceding, see Lefèbvre, ch. xiv. *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 471 sqq.; Mailath, *Gesch. Oestreichs*, B. v. S. 255 f.; Pelet de la Lozère, *Opinions de Napoléon*.

Würtzburg and Eichstädt traverses the margraviate of Anspach, belonging to Prussia. A circuitous route might have spoilt Napoleon's combinations, and his troops took that of Anspach at the risk of provoking the hostility of the King of Prussia by this violation of his neutrality. By the 8th of October 180,000 French had crossed the Danube at different points: Bernadotte and the Bavarians at Ingolstadt, whence he marched rapidly upon Munich; Davoust and Marmont at Neuburg; Soult, Lannes, Murat and the Guard at Donauwerth and Dillingen. The Austrian general, Kienmayer, with 12,000 men, appointed to guard the bridges, was compelled to fly beyond the Isar. Marmont and Soult advanced towards Augsburg; Napoleon in person, with Lannes and Murat, on Zusmarshausen. Ney, with 40,000 men, remained on the left bank of the Danube. Mack might have retreated into the Tyrol and joined the army of the Archduke John; but he persisted in thinking that Napoleon was still in his front, and that Bernadotte alone had got into his rear. Under the influence of this idea, recalling the corps which he had posted in the Black Forest, he wheeled about, and advanced, as he supposed, against Bernadotte and Marmont. He was soon undeceived. At Wertingen his advanced guard fell in with Murat and the French cavalry, and was completely routed; 4000 Austrian grenadiers and all their artillery were captured (October 8th). This affair opened Mack's eyes; but, though the road to the Tyrol was still open, he persisted in remaining at Ulm.[8] Matters growing hourly worse, he at length adopted the resolution of forcing his way towards Bohemia. With this view he endeavoured to force Ney's positions at Gunzburg and Albeck, but was repulsed with considerable loss (October 9th). Meanwhile Napoleon, investing Ulm with his centre and right, extended his left so as to cut off Mack's retreat to the Tyrol. The investment on this side was completed by the occupation of Memmingen by Soult, October 14th.

Meanwhile the Russians were approaching; their advanced guard had passed Linz, and the Archduke Charles had detached thirty-three battalions from the army of Italy to proceed to Mack's rescue. Napoleon drew closer the blockade of Ulm. Shut up in such a town with 60,000 men, with provisions and ammunition

[8] Military authorities say, that besides the Tyrol and the road to Bohemia, Mack had also two other means of escape; namely, by entering Switzerland at Schaffhausen, where he might have been joined by the Archduke John from the Tyrol; or by retiring upon the Main and thence into Hesse, and compelling its sovereign to make common cause with him. This last march would have put him in communication with the Hanoverian, Russian, and Swedish troops, and have decided the King of Prussia. Garden, t. ix. p. 55, note.

only for a small garrison, Mack's position was becoming desperate. Another attempt was made to force the road to Bavaria, October 14th, when the Austrians were defeated with great loss by Ney at Elchingen. The Archduke Ferdinand, however, and Prince Schwarzenberg, succeeded in forcing a passage with upwards of 20,000 men, and gained Heidenheim. On the 15th, Napoleon, having carried the heights which command Ulm, summoned Mack to surrender, and in an interview with Prince Lichtenstein pointed out that Mack's position was inextricable, threatened, if forced to it, to treat the Austrian army as he had treated the garrison of Jaffa. To avoid an assault, Mack capitulated on the 17th. Ulm, with all its magazines and artillery, was to be surrendered, the garrison were to lay down their arms as prisoners of war, if no Austrian or Russian troops should appear before midnight on the 25th of October to raise the blockade; but if they did appear, the garrison was to be permitted to join them, with all their arms, artillery, and cavalry. Mack had obtained this respite with great difficulty, which, at least, had the advantage of detaining the French army so many days. Yet on the 19th he signed a second capitulation, without any apparent reason, by which, on the assurance of Marshal Berthier of the impossibility of his being relieved, he surrendered Ulm on the following day; stipulating, however, that Marshal Ney's division should remain in the environs till the 25th. On the morning of October 20th, 24,000 Austrians defiled before Napoleon, and laid down their arms at his feet as prisoners of war. Among the trophies were forty colours and sixty guns.[9] On the very day of this second capitulation, the division which had escaped from Ulm under Prince Ferdinand, pursued by Murat and Dupont, after one or two previous defeats, was surrounded near Nördlingen, and compelled to surrender at discretion by the capitulation of Trochtelfingen. The prince, however, escaped this disaster, having pushed on into Bohemia with 2000 horse.

The Russian advanced guard under Prince Bagration had effected a junction, October 16th, at Braunau with Kienmayer, who had retreated beyond the Inn, pursued and harassed by Bernadotte and the Bavarians. But they were compelled to evacuate Braunau on the approach of the French, who, with the exception of Ney's corps, advanced rapidly after the surrender of Ulm. Lannes

[9] Respecting the surrender of Ulm, see *Mémoires du Général Rapp*, chap. vi. Mack was arraigned before a court-martial, which, singularly enough, was presided over by Mélas, who had made almost as disgraceful a capitulation as himself. *Homme d'état*, t. viii. p. 487. Mack was condemned to a short imprisonment, but ultimately retired on a pension.

occupied Braunau October 29th; Bernadotte entered Salzburg on the 30th. On the 4th of November the French army passed the Enns. On the 5th, Ney took the fort of Scharnitz, which opened the road to Innsbrück. On the 7th an action took place at Maria Zell between the advanced guard of Davoust and the Austrians under Meerveldt; who lost 4000 prisoners and sixteen guns. On the 9th the Russians repassed the Danube at Grein; and on the 11th an action between Marshal Mortier and Prince Kutusoff took place near Dürrenstein, a castle rendered famous by the captivity of Richard Cœur de Lion. The French general, who had only 5000 men, cut his way through four times that number of Russians, and succeeded in reaching Davoust's division. Kutusoff continued his retreat towards Moravia, to join the Russian corps that was coming to his aid. In these disastrous circumstances, the Emperor of Austria, in order to save his capital, sent Count Giulay to Napoleon's headquarters to inquire on what terms he would grant an armistice for the negociation of a peace. Napoleon demanded that the Russians should return into their own country, that the Hungarian insurrection should be dissolved, and that Venice and the Tyrol should be provisionally abandoned to the French. Francis II. refused these conditions, which were, in fact, equivalent to surrendering at discretion. But it seems probable that the offer was made only to gain time for the advance of the Russians under Buxhovden, and the completion of the Hungarian insurrection. Meanwhile the French army continued its march along the right bank of the Danube, and on the 13th of November Murat and Lannes entered Vienna without resistance. Such had been the orders of Francis II., on quitting his capital a few days before to join at Brünn the Emperor Alexander, who accompanied the second Russian division: and in fact Vienna was not in a condition to make any defence.

We must now turn our eyes awhile towards Italy. We have seen that the Austrians had made vast preparations in that quarter, in the anticipation that it would be the principal scene of action. But Napoleon's movements gave quite an unexpected turn to affairs, and rendered the campaign in Italy only subsidiary to that in Germany. Masséna had at first only 30,000 men to oppose to the vast army of the Archduke Charles, and he was therefore instructed to stand on the defensive on the Adige. On the other hand, the Archduke, through Mack's disasters, having compelled him to detach a large force to the assistance of that general, was prevented from taking the offensive. After the King of Naples had ratified the Treaty of Paris, Gouvion St. Cyr, who occupied the

peninsula of Otranto with 25,000 men, hastened to join Masséna. But these troops had not yet come up when Masséna, whose army by reinforcements from other quarters now numbered near 60,000 men, and about equalled the Archduke's, having learned the capitulation of Ulm, and foreseeing that the Archduke would fly to the defence of Vienna, impetuously attacked the Austrians in their position at Caldiero between Verona and Vicenza (October 29th). A desperate struggle ensued, which lasted three days, in which the French lost 6000 men, were completely repulsed, abandoned the field of battle, and retreated to Verona. Yet M. Thiers and other French writers[10] claim a brilliant victory! The Archduke Charles was now at liberty to pursue his road into Austria, by way of Croatia; a movement, however, which could not but look like a retreat. He was pursued by the French; and a corps of 5000 men, which he had left behind to cover his march, was compelled to capitulate at Casa Albertini, November 2nd. He summoned his brother John with his army to join him from the Tyrol; the two Archdukes effected a junction near Cilly, towards the end of November, and with their united forces hastened to the Danube, but were too late to be present at the decisive battle. The Archduke John had also summoned Jellachich from the Vorarlberg, but that commander had been obliged to capitulate to the French.

The French made no halt at Vienna, but crossed the Danube, November 14th, in pursuit of the Russians. Prince Auersperg, who had been instructed to destroy the Tabor bridge, suffered himself to be deceived by Murat, who pretended that a truce had been concluded, and the French were permitted to pass over. This *ruse* was as good as a victory to the French. Marshal Lannes came up with the Russians at Hollabrünn, November 15th. Kutusoff, to escape from a bad position, pretended to parley for an armistice; and leaving Prince Bagration behind, with a corps of 6000 men, whom he abandoned in order to deceive the enemy, hastened his march northwards. Bagration, though attacked by upwards of 30,000 men at Hollabrünn, November 16th, and again at Guntersdorf on the following day, contrived to save part of his troops, and rejoined Kutusoff at Wischau, on the 19th. That general, having been joined by the Russian army under Buxhövden

[10] *Hist. du Consulat et de l'Empire*, t. vi. liv. 23: cf. *Victoires et Conquêtes*, t. xv. p. 164 sqq.; Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 171. Lefèbvre, ch. xiv. is more just, and at least allows that it was a drawn battle. The true state of the case may be seen from the Archduke Charles' report, drawn up with his characteristic modesty, and printed from the archives of the Austrian War-department, by Count Mailath, *Gesch. Oestreichs*, B. v. S. 260-270.

from Galicia, had now arrested his retrograde march. Murat had entered Brünn, November 18th, and Napoleon fixed his head-quarters in that town on the 20th.

At this moment, the Emperors Francis and Alexander were at Olmütz. The Russian Emperor had had a little before an interview with Frederick William III. at Berlin, where he arrived unexpectedly, October 25th. Demonstrations of esteem and affection were lavished on both sides; the Queen, especially, was charmed by Alexander's grace of manner and chivalrous bearing. The King of Prussia and his subjects were, at this time, filled with rage and indignation at Napoleon's violation of the Prussian territory; a cry for war again arose at Berlin; when suddenly, all these transports were damped by the terrible news of Mack's capitulation. The arrival of the Archduke Anthony, Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, October 30th, and his recital of the Austrian disasters, filled the sovereigns with dejection. Alexander, however, persuaded Frederick William to sign a secret convention at Potsdam, November 3rd, by which he acceded to the Coalition; with the reservation, however, of making a last attempt to bring Napoleon to moderate views. As the conditions of a general peace, based on that of Lunéville, a military frontier was to be demanded for Austria, an indemnity for the King of Sardinia, the evacuation of Holland and Switzerland, a guarantee for the independence of those two countries, and the separation of the crown of Italy from that of France. Count Haugwitz was to carry these conditions to Napoleon, and, in case of their rejection, war was to be declared, December 15th. At the same time, all the Prussian forces were put upon a war footing.

By way of compensation for the French insult, one of the Prussian King's first steps had been to forward to Alexander an authority for his troops to traverse Silesia and Lauenburg; in consequence of which, 36,000 Russians had entered Silesia, while 18,000 more under Tolstoï, and 12,000 Swedes, disembarking at Stralsund, directed their march through Lauenburg upon Hanover. Of this last army, Gustavus IV. of Sweden was to have taken the command in person; and, after its union with 12,000 Hanoverians at Stade, and some British troops under Lord Cathcart, it was to have made a powerful diversion in Holland. But that capricious monarch, who had called on Prussia for an explanation of her armaments, offended by an imaginary slight on the part of the Emperor of Russia, laid down the command of the combined army, and recalled his troops, already on their march for the Elbe, into Pomerania. Several weeks were lost in negociations before the

Swedes were again put in motion; and shortly after the battle of Austerlitz changed the policy of the various Cabinets.[11] Frederick William also announced to the French Government, October 14th, that henceforth he regarded himself as released from all his engagements respecting the neutrality of North Germany.

Frederick William III., however, had not made these efforts, though necessary for his own honour, and even safety, without demanding to be compensated. In return for his eventual co-operation, he demanded that the King of England should cede to him Hanover, in exchange for the Prussian possessions in Westphalia. The English Cabinet, however, would not accede to this demand; but promised to cede that part of the Electorate which is surrounded by the Prussian dominions, provided Prussia should make war upon France.[12]

Even now Frederick William's intentions were not open and sincere; and had they been so, Haugwitz was not a fit agent to carry them out. In spite of the Convention, it is evident that a great latitude had been allowed to that minister; that his pretensions were to rise or fall, according to the fortune of the French arms. Haugwitz did not obtain an interview with Napoleon till November 28th, at his headquarters at Brünn. The French Emperor diverted the negociations from the main subject to collateral ones, and Haugwitz, who saw that a great battle was impending, was not unwilling to wait. Napoleon's situation was by no means secure. He was faced by an Austro-Russian army, superior in number to his own; 45,000 English, Russians, and Swedes were assembled in North Germany; the Hungarian levy or insurrection was going on; the Archdukes Charles and John were advancing. Under these circumstances, Prussia really held in her hands the fate of the campaign, and the destinies of Europe. Had Frederick William put his troops in motion, the allies would not have delivered the battle of Austerlitz; they would have waited till Haugwitz had discharged his mission, and have allowed time for the Prussian troops to come up.

On the night before he quitted Potsdam, Alexander, accompanied by the King and Queen of Prussia, had visited by torch-light the tomb of Frederick the Great, in the garrison-church of that place; the sovereigns had prostrated themselves before the ashes of that illustrious warrior, and had sworn to one another an eternal friendship. But events soon showed that this romantic scene was a mere sentimental phantasmagoria, without earnestness

[11] Garden, t. ix. p. 83 sq.
[12] Garden, t. ix. p. 72; *Homme d'Etat*, t. vii. p. 482; Lefèbvre, ch. xv.; Menzel, B. vi. S. 462.

or meaning. From Potsdam, Alexander flew to put himself at the head of his army at Olmütz. Here he supplicated in vain for an auxiliary corps of 10,000 Prussians; more, perhaps, with the view of irrevocably engaging Frederick William in the war, than for the actual benefit of their services. The King of Prussia could no longer hope to be sincerely pardoned by Napoleon. His only safety lay in striking a rapid blow; but when it was necessary to act, his heart failed him, and his sword fell back into its scabbard. He determined to await the result of Haugwitz's negociations. Thus, as a French writer has observed,[13] in the hands of this prince an armed mediation united all the inconveniences both of neutrality and war. Without the security of the first, or the glorious chances of the second, it menaced, without coercing, Napoleon, and deceived Austria and Russia with false hopes. We now return to the campaign.

The Austro-Russian army occupied a very strong position between Olmütz and Olschan. The foremost columns of the Archduke Charles had reached Weinpassing, on the road between Oedenburg and Vienna. The Russian corps of Essen and Benningsen were also coming up. The allies, therefore, had every reason to await the decision of Prussia, and to postpone a battle, till December 15th, whilst the same motives urged Napoleon to seek one. Alexander, however, and the youthful warriors who surrounded him, trusting in their superior force, were for immediate action. Another motive was, the want of magazines for the support of so large a force. Some parley took place before the battle. The Emperors of Austria and Russia sent Counts Giulay and Stadion to Napoleon's camp, with proposals for a peace, but on conditions which the French Emperor could not listen to. Napoleon, on his side, on the arrival of Alexander at Olmütz, twice despatched General Savary to compliment him, and to request an interview. His object was, apparently, to impress the Russians with the idea that he dreaded a battle, and thus to entice them into one. Alexander declined the proposed interview; but he sent Prince Dolgorouki, who only offended the French Emperor by his inept and arrogant pretensions.

A feigned retreat of Napoleon's for some miles increased the ardour of the Russians for battle. Kutusoff's plan was to turn the right of the French, in order to drive them into the mountains of Bohemia, and cut off their communications with Vienna. Napoleon immediately penetrated this design, and delivered at Auster-

[13] Lefèbvre, ch xvi.

LITZ, December 2nd, a battle, which has been reckoned one of his masterpieces. Although he had fewer men than his opponents, yet, at the decisive point, he had massed twice as many as they. The heights of Pratzen, which lay in the middle of the Austro-Russian line, were the key of their position. These he stormed and took, thus dividing the line of the allies, and separating their centre both from the right and left wings. The battle was now lost, though some detached fights ensued. The losses of the allies have been much exaggerated by French writers, but were still very great; 12,000 men were killed or wounded, 15,000 made prisoners, and eighty guns were captured. The French loss was probably 10,000 men,[14] though Napoleon's bulletin stated it at only 3900.

The defeat was terrible, but with skill and courage perhaps not irretrievable. The formidable position which the Austro-Russians had held at Olmütz, might have been regained and defended with 50,000 men. The Archdukes Charles and John were advancing with 80,000 men, who had not been beaten; they were in communication with Hungary, which was fast rising; the Archduke Ferdinand was bringing 20,000 men from Bohemia; another Russian corps was approaching, and the whole Russian Empire was behind them; 180,000 Prussians, Saxons, and Hessians were in arms, but on these perhaps it would have been imprudent to reckon. The allied Emperors and their general, Kutusoff, appear, however, to have entirely lost their heads and their courage, and gave up the game in despair. After an interview with Alexander, Dec. 4th, Francis II. proceeded by appointment to the French camp. He found Napoleon at the bivouac of Saroschütz. Pointing to the nearest watch-fire, Napoleon exclaimed, "I must receive your majesty in the only palace I have inhabited these two months." "You make so good a use of it," replied Francis, "that you must find it very pleasant." The two Emperors soon came to an agreement for an armistice, which was definitively concluded, Dec. 6th, at Austerlitz. The French were to occupy Austria with Venice and its territory, the circle of Montabor in Bohemia, and all to the east of the road from Tabor to Linz, also a part of Moravia and the town of Presburg in Hungary; the Russian army was to evacuate Moravia and Hungary within a fortnight, and Galicia within a month; the levies in Hungary and Bohemia were to be stopped; no foreign army was to enter the Austrian territory; negociations for a peace were to be opened at Nikolsburg.[15] The day after the signature of this armistice, Napoleon levied on the Austrian provinces

[14] Mailath, B. v. S. 274.

[15] Martens, *Recueil*, t. viii. p. 386.

a contribution of 100 million francs. On December 5th the Russians began their homeward march towards Poland. The Emperor Alexander had given no pledge as to his ulterior intentions. Napoleon, who wished to gain his friendship, not only ordered his retreat to be respected, but also sent back Prince Repnin and all the soldiers of the Imperial Guard who had been captured at Austerlitz. Alexander placed his troops in Silesia and Mecklenburg at the disposal of the King of Prussia, and released him from the engagements which he had entered into by the Convention of Potsdam.

Frederick William's prospects began to look somewhat gloomy. When Haugwitz congratulated Napoleon on his success, the latter answered: "This compliment was meant for others, but fortune has changed the address." He then bitterly denounced the King of Prussia's understanding with his enemies; but ended with promising to forgive what had happened, provided Prussia would form a close alliance with France, offensive and defensive, and as a pledge of sincerity should take formal possession of Hanover. General Don, with the Hanoverian legion and some English troops, had disembarked at Stade, November 17th; some Swedish and Russian troops also subsequently passed the Elbe, and the Electorate had been restored to the possession of George III. Haugwitz, instead of fulfilling his instructions, signed, at Schönbrunn, December 15th—the very day on which Frederick William had promised to declare war against France if his ultimatum was refused—a convention laid before him by Napoleon, of which the principal points were, the cession to France of Neufchâtel in Switzerland, and of the remaining portion of the Duchy of Clèves; also of the Principality of Anspach to Bavaria. Prussia, in return, was to take possession of the Electorate of Hanover.

The armistice between France and Austria was soon followed by the Peace of Presburg, signed December 26th;[16] to which place the negociations, if such they can be called, had been transferred. Talleyrand had followed the French army; the treaty was drawn up by him, and the Austrian plenipotentiaries had only to affix their signatures. The Emperor Francis recognised all that Napoleon had done in Italy, and renounced the Venetian States ceded to him by the Treaties of Campo Formio and Lunéville. These were now to be united to the Kingdom of Italy. Napoleon was recognised as King of Italy; but that kingdom was ultimately to be separated from France; though Napoleon was to name his

[16] Martens, t. viii. p 388.

successor. Thus the House of Austria was completely excluded from Italy, where she had ruled for centuries, and where she now possessed not even a single fief. The Peace included Napoleon's allies, the Electors of Bavaria, Würtemberg, and Baden; which princes, as we have seen, he had attached to his fortunes by giving them so large a share of the ecclesiastical spoils in the matter of the indemnifications. The title of King now assumed by the Electors of Würtemberg and Bavaria was recognised by Francis; and these two sovereigns caused their new dignity to be proclaimed January 1st 1806. The Elector of Baden assumed the title of Grand Duke. By Article VIII. Austria made considerable territorial cessions to these three princes. Bavaria, especially, was augmented by the addition of the Vorarlberg, the Tyrol, with Brixen and Trent, the Principality of Eichstädt, part of that of Passau, and several other districts. Napoleon regarded the transfer of the Tyrol to Bavaria as necessary to the safety of his Italian kingdom. The cession of these provinces was particularly grievous to the Emperor Francis. They had been the patrimony of his family from the most ancient times; from their geographical situation they were necessary to the security of his frontiers; and he now saw himself compelled to abandon them to princes against whom he had more than one cause of complaint, and who had failed in their engagements towards him. Austria was cut off from her communications with Italy and Switzerland, and deprived of her influence in Germany; she lost a population of nearly three million souls, with a revenue of between thirteen and fourteen million florins.[17] Salzburg was the only compensation which she received, and the hereditary right of appointing the Grand Master of the Teutonic Order. The Grand Duke Leopold, to whom Salzburg had been assigned in 1803, was compensated with the Principality of Würtzburg, with the electoral vote.

Such had been the wonderful effects of a campaign of two months! one of the military *chefs d'œuvre* of Napoleon, though easily achieved through the unskilfulness of the generals with whom he had to contend. But the Peace of Presburg was too unjust and too humiliating to be lasting. A treaty exacted by force, which compromised the safety of the Austrian monarchy, and violated the rights and constitution of the German Empire, could be regarded only as a truce, to be broken on the first favourable opportunity. The victor, by abusing his power, and exceeding the bounds of justice and moderation, was only preparing his own retribution, and arming against himself the animosity of all Europe.

[17] Garden, t. ix. p. 50 sq.

Napoleon's wonderful success had experienced only one material drawback. On October 21st 1805, Nelson had almost annihilated, off TRAFALGAR, the combined French and Spanish fleets. We forbear to detail Nelson's chase after Villeneuve, and the particulars of his greatest, but last, victory, almost too dearly purchased with his life. These events are fresh in the memory of every English reader. It will suffice to remind him that of the combined fleet of thirty-three sail of the line, twenty were taken or destroyed by the English at Trafalgar, while four that had escaped from the action were subsequently captured by Sir Richard Strahan, November 4th. This decisive battle secured to England the sovereignty of the seas. The news of it reached Napoleon on his march to Vienna. He saw at once the whole extent of its consequences, and vented his anguish in the exclamation, "I cannot be everywhere!" The destruction or capture of a French squadron of five vessels off St. Domingo, by Admiral Duckworth, February 6th 1806, gave the finishing blow to the French marine. It never rose again during the war.[18]

To the loss of her greatest naval hero, England was soon after to add that of her foremost statesman. Pitt expired January 23rd 1806, at the age of forty-six. Whether he sacrificed the future of England to the present, or whether he saved both, may be matter of dispute. In this question, the nature of events affords his antagonists some advantages. The meanest of us may reckon the burthens which his policy entailed upon the country; the wisest of us may not be able to estimate the misfortunes which under a different course might have overwhelmed it. But every Englishman must regard the portentous struggle with Napoleon as one of the grandest pages in the annals of his country; and all who shall candidly examine Pitt's conduct in that great shock of nations will agree to admire his lofty views, his unshaken fortitude, his disinterested patriotism. Pitt's ministry was succeeded by that of "all the talents," with Lord Grenville at its head, and Fox for Foreign Secretary. Fox, who had always denounced the war as unjust and impolitic, opened negociations with the French Government for a peace; which, however, as they had no result, we shall not here relate.[19] They went off chiefly on the subject of Sicily, which the French Government at first consented to include in the *uti possidetis*, but withdrew that concession after effecting a peace

[18] From May 1803 to October 1806, the combined French and Spanish navies had lost 32 ships of the line, 26 frigates, and 83 smaller ships. *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 115.

[19] They will be found in Lefèbvre, ch. xix.; and more fully in Garden, t. ix. p. 290-306, and official correspondence, p. 310-494. See also the *Historical Memoir* of Sir Robert Adair, English ambassador at Vienna.

with Russia. Fox did not live to see these negociations terminated. He expired a few months after his great antagonist, September 13th 1806.

The nature of the convention which Haugwitz had concluded at Schönbrunn with Napoleon, disclosed on that minister's return to Berlin, December 25th, filled Frederick William III. with astonishment and grief. With his usual timid and compromising policy, he laid the treaty before a Grand Council, collected all the principal objections to it in the form of an explanatory memoir, which he annexed to the act of ratification, and sent Haugwitz to Paris to defend this mutilated monument of his weakness and irresolution. At the same time he caused his troops to enter Hanover; but hastened to inform the British Government that the occupation of the Electorate was only provisional till the general peace. He also proceeded to reduce his army to the peace establishment, either from false economy or by way of proof of his conciliating disposition; and he invited Russia and England to withdraw their troops from Hanover and Lauenburg. Never, as a French writer observes,[20] were so many fatal errors committed in so short a time. Napoleon kept his eyes fixed on the Prussian King. He was persuaded that Frederick William was secretly hostile to him; that he was only seeking to gain time and avoid a rupture with England. But he said nothing, deferred an interview with Haugwitz, waited till Prussia had disarmed herself; when he received the Prussian minister, brow-beat and frightened him with one of those bursts of rage which were half real, half assumed. A few days after, Talleyrand notified to Haugwitz that the treaty of December 15th not having been ratified within the prescribed time must be considered as null, and laid before him for signature another and more disadvantageous one, in which no compensation was allowed to Prussia for the cession of Anspach; and, in order to involve her in a war with the English, Napoleon's principal object, she was required to shut against them the mouths of the Weser and Elbe and all the Prussian ports, and to declare the occupation of Hanover definitive. Haugwitz was told that if he refused to accept this treaty, the French armies would immediately march into Prussia; and under this threat he signed it, February 16th 1806. Frederick William III. ratified it, March 9th. Thus the successor of Frederick the Great had fallen all at once to the humble condition of an Elector of Brandenburg.

In consequence of this treaty, the King of Prussia published a

[20] Lefèbvre, ch. xvii.

fresh patent, in which he declared that having by a convention with France, and in consideration of the cession of three provinces, obtained lawful possession of the German States of the House of Brunswick Luneburg, belonging to France by right of conquest, he hereby took possession of them, and henceforward they were to be considered as subject to Prussia. The Baron d'Ompteda, minister of George III., as Elector of Hanover, at Berlin, demanded his passports, April 7th; and on the 20th the King published a manifest reproaching Prussia with her conduct, and calling upon the Emperor and the German body for aid, as one of the States of the Empire. At the same time an embargo was laid on Prussian vessels in British ports, and all communication with Prussia forbidden. The blockade of the Ems, Weser, Elbe, and Trave was declared (May 16th), but that of the Trave was raised a few days after in favour of Russian and Swedish commerce. On the 11th of June, Great Britain declared war against Prussia.[21] The occupation of Hanover by the Prussians also led to a declaration of war against that Power by Sweden. Gustavus IV. was a warm partizan of Great Britain; even against the desire of the British Cabinet, he persisted in occupying the Duchy of Lauenburg, part of the Hanoverian dominions, after Prussia had announced her intention to take possession of them. As, however, hostilities were chiefly confined to a blockade of the Prussian ports by the Swedes, and were terminated in a few months without any event of importance, we forbear to relate them.[22]

Such, in Northern Europe, were the consequences of the battle of Austerlitz and Peace of Presburg. We must now survey their effects in the South. Upwards of 13,000 Russians from Corfû, and about 6000 English from Malta, had landed in the Bay of Naples, November 20th 1805. The King of the Two Sicilies, although bound by the treaty of September 21st to resist by force any infringement of his neutrality, not only made no opposition to the landing of these troops, but openly joined in the Coalition, by putting the Neapolitan army at the disposal of General Lacy, the Russian commander. The Court of Naples thus committed, no doubt, a technical breach of its engagements. But the treaty had been forced upon it by an act of high-handed despotism, just as a highwayman might compel a man to sign a bond with a pistol at his head. The matter, therefore, resolves itself into a question of

[21] Garden, t. ix. p. 81 sqq.

[22] For the latter years of the reign of Gustavus IV. see *Historisches Gemälde der letzten Regierungsjahre des gewesenen Königs Gustav IV. Adolphs*; translated from a semi-official Swedish work (2 vols. 8vo. 1810).

policy; and in this view no doubt Ferdinand IV., or rather Queen Caroline, committed an error, but a very natural and excusable one. The Anglo-Russian and Neapolitan armies when united numbered more than 60,000 men, and it was decided that this force should traverse Italy and throw itself upon Masséna's rear. To oppose this movement, the viceroy, Prince Eugene Beauharnais, detached all the men that could be spared from Gouvion St. Cyr's force at Venice, mobilised 25,000 of the National Guard, and with the addition of the garrison of Ancona, and some detachments from Leghorn, collected on the frontiers of the Roman States an army of 45,000 men.

Napoleon at first dissembled his resentment against the Court of Naples. It was not till after the Peace of Presburg had been signed that he drew up at Schönbrunn, December 27th 1805, a proclamation addressed to his army, but intended for all Europe, in which he denounced the perfidy and ingratitude of the King of Naples, lauded his own generosity, and announced that the Neapolitan dynasty had ceased to reign. The proclamation, however, was not published at Paris till January 31st 1806, after Napoleon's return, when he had ripened his plans and assured himself of all the advantages of the Treaty of Presburg. Never before had conqueror employed such despotic language, disposed so arbitrarily of a great kingdom. Napoleon gave the nominal command of the army destined against Naples to his brother Joseph, thus designating him as the successor of Ferdinand IV.; but the operations were in reality directed by Masséna. The invasion of the Neapolitan dominions was a mere military promenade. The day after his defeat at Austerlitz, the Emperor Alexander had directed General Lacy to evacuate Italy and return to Corfû. The English were consequently also obliged to retire, but they proceeded only into Sicily. Queen Caroline, thus deserted by her allies, despatched Cardinal Ruffo to deprecate Napoleon's wrath, and to offer very humble conditions; but he refused to receive her ambassador. Ferdinand, perceiving that all was lost, embarked for Sicily, January 13th. Caroline, who inherited her mother's spirit, showed a more virile disposition. She remained behind, raised an army composed of the brigands of Calabria and the Abruzzi and the *lazzaroni* of the metropolis, with whom were joined the prisoners in the jails. But the richer and more respectable classes, alarmed at a proceeding which threatened their properties and their lives, also armed, formed themselves into regiments, and awaited the approach of the French as liberators. Masséna arrived before Naples with the centre of the French army without having fought a battle, February

14th, and entered the capital without resistance. The Queen did not quit Naples till the French had arrived, when she embarked for Sicily. Joseph Bonaparte entered Naples, February 15th. He was received by the common people with visible feelings of hatred, by the citizens and nobles with undisguised joy.

The Prince Royal had retired into Calabria with about 18,000 men under Marshal Rosenheim and Count Roger de Damas; while the Prince of Hesse Philippsthal, with another division of the Neapolitan army, had thrown himself into Gaeta and announced his intention to hold out to the last extremity. Masséna undertook the siege of Gaeta; General Reynier was despatched against the Count de Damas and Rosenheim, whose troops he soon dispersed. The Prince Royal embarked at Scylla for Sicily. Joseph now undertook a journey into Apulia and Calabria, and received at Sciliagno the imperial decree of April 1st 1806, which constituted him King of the Two Sicilies. The crown was to be hereditary in his male line; and his rights to the crown of France were reserved, but the two crowns could not be united on the same head. Napoleon, however, still kept his brother in dependence by giving him, at the same time with the Neapolitan crown, the dignity of Grand Elector of the French Empire, and thus reducing him to the rank of a feudatory.

King Joseph did not enjoy his new dignity altogether unmolested. The revolution had caused great discontent in the provinces, the lawless population of which revolted at the strict and severe administration introduced by the French. Their discontent was encouraged by Queen Caroline, who opened a correspondence with the brigands of Calabria, engaged their two most famous chiefs, Michael Pezzo, better known as Fra Diavolo, and Sciarpa, to organise an insurrection, and placed them at the head of the royal army. The movement was assisted by the English. General Stuart, embarking at Messina, July 1st 1806, with 6000 English and 3000 Neapolitans, landed in the Gulf of Eufemia. Stuart defeated at Maïda, July 5th, the French under Reynier, inflicted on them a loss of 4000 men, and compelled them to retreat to Catanzaro. A general rising of the peasantry now took place; many of the French were massacred, Reynier was surrounded at Catanzaro, but succeeded in cutting his way through the insurgent bands and reaching Cassano. The surrender of Gaeta at length enabled Masséna to come to his assistance. On July 10th the intrepid commandant of that place was wounded in the head and conveyed on board an English vessel; and on the 18th it capitulated. Masséna soon succeeded in putting down the insurgent royalists. General Stuart re-

embarked for Sicily, September 5th, and thus put a virtual end to the insurrection. Some of the more obstinate, however, still held out, as Fra Diavolo; which leader, however, was captured at Sora, and guillotined at Naples, November 10th.

After his splendid campaign of 1805, Napoleon proceeded with his favourite object of obliterating all traces of republicanism. On January 1st 1806, the republican calendar was suppressed and the Gregorian restored. The Pantheon was again dedicated to divine worship. Before long the Tribunate was to be abolished, although that body had paraded its servility by voting that a column and statue should be erected to the Emperor in one of the principal places of Paris with the inscription: *A grateful country to Napoleon the Great.* Bonaparte, who, on his accession to the consulate, had proclaimed aloud the principles of liberty and democratic equality, now proceeded to elevate his family by royal and princely marriages and promotions. His step-son, Eugene Beauharnais, was married to a daughter of the King of Bavaria. The Grand Duke of Baden demanded for his son the hand of Eugene's sister, Stéphanie. Of Napoleon's three sisters, the principality of Guastalla was conferred upon Pauline, married to Prince Borghese. Eliza, married to the Corsican Bacciochi, had, as we have seen, been invested with the principalities of Lucca and Piombino, to which Massa Carrera was added. His third sister, Caroline, was married to Murat, on whom Berg and Clèves, ceded by Prussia, were now bestowed, with the title of Grand Duke of Berg. Two more brothers besides Joseph were soon to receive the royal diadem. Thus the grand fiefs and grand vassals of the middle ages were to be restored in favour of Napoleon's despotism, and to the aggrandisement of his family and dependants, and France and Europe were to be replunged into the feudal system, which it had been the grand object of the Revolution to overthrow. Such was to be the unexpected result of the philosophy of the eighteenth century! The Venetian States were united to the Kingdom of Italy by imperial decrees, and the Provinces of Dalmatia, Istria, the Friuli, Cadora, Belluno, Conegliano, Treviso, Feltre, Bassano, Vicenza, Padua, Rovigo, were erected into duchies, grand fiefs of the Empire. Six more fiefs were created in the Kingdom of Naples, three in Parma and Piacenza. But Napoleon did not yet venture to appoint the holders of them. This honour was at present reserved for two or three of his most illustrious companions. Berthier was presented with the Principality of Neufchâtel; Talleyrand with that of Benevento; Bernadotte with that of Ponte Corvo.

A distinction began at this period to be drawn between France

and the French Empire. Napoleon had revived, and with more prospect of success than any previous monarch, the project of a universal monarchy. France was to become the centre of a political system, round which other states were to gravitate. But her government having become a despotism, a republic among her satellites would have been an incongruity; and the Dutch, who had already sacrificed their independence, were therefore now to lose even the forms of freedom. Their subjection to France had been productive of nothing but misery and discontent. The maritime war into which they had been compelled to enter had deprived them of their colonies and their trade.[23] Even the former partizans of France in Holland abhorred a domination from which there was no escape, and longed for the return of the House of Nassau and the prosperity enjoyed under its sway. But, instead of this, they were to have a sovereign forced upon them from the house of their oppressor. The elevation of M. Schimmelpenninck to the rank of Grand Pensionary, already recorded, and a reduction of the powers of the Assembly, had been steps towards this new revolution. To have a monarch thrust upon them seemed to the Dutch a fresh calamity. Napoleon's will to this purpose was notified to the Grand Pensionary early in 1806, and in May some Batavian deputies appeared, as if spontaneously, in Paris to demand the Emperor's brother, Louis, for their sovereign. Yet the Dutch Assembly had declared that they acted by constraint in this matter, to avert from the republic irreparable evils. Louis himself, who, with the title of King of Holland, received also that of Constable of France, reminding him that he was but a feudatory of the Empire, seems hardly to have desired a dignity which in fact made him only a sort of prefect under his brother. The burthens imposed upon his kingdom were of a corresponding nature. Holland was compelled to increase its army from 10,000 to 50,000 men, and to keep it on that footing by the French method of conscription. It is just, however, to say that Louis resisted as much as he could the tyranny of Napoleon.[24] The French Emperor did not venture to convert the Helvetic Republic into a monarchy, but contented himself with the office and title of Mediator.

The appropriation of the kingdoms of Italy, Naples, and Holland, and the erection of the Italian fiefs, were the direct results of conquest; the overthrow of the German Empire, the most audacious, and, it may be added, the most lasting act of Napoleon's reign, and the erection on its ruins of another subservient State,

[23] The Dutch colony of the Cape of Good Hope was reduced by the English in January 1806.

[24] *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 102.

the CONFEDERATION OF THE RHINE, though also due to the preponderance of the French arms, were effected by the fiat of Napoleon in the midst of peace, and with the consent of the Powers forming the Confederation. The German Empire had long been declining. The Reformation had struck the first blow at it by dividing its unity and separating the interests of its various States. The growth of the Prussian kingdom, and especially the reign of Frederick the Great, had tended further to its ruin, not only by weakening the power and prestige of the House of Austria, in which the Imperial crown had become almost an heir-loom, but also by destroying all respect for the forms of the ancient *régime*. The consequences became apparent in the war with the French Republic. The want of union among the German States in that struggle, we have already seen. Many of them adhered to the policy of defection adopted by Prussia, and hence the Imperial authority became little more than nominal. The Treaties of Campo Formio and Lunéville, the cession of the left bank of the Rhine, and the indemnifications and secularisations consequent upon it, gave the first tokens of dissolution; and after the Treaty of Presburg the Holy Roman Empire existed only by sufferance.

The project of a Confederation of the secondary German States under the protection of some great foreign Power, originated with the Baron de Waitz, principal minister of the Elector of Hesse, in 1804. It was proposed that the Confederation should consist of purely German States, that is, such as were unconnected with any other country; a regulation that excluded Austria, Prussia, and Hanover.[25] The scheme was favourably received by Talleyrand; but so long as Napoleon hoped to obtain the alliance of Prussia, nothing was done towards its execution. That hope being entirely dissipated in 1806, the project was revived. The Baron Dalberg, Arch-Chancellor of the Empire, was the prime mover in it; and especially he appointed Cardinal Fesch, Napoleon's uncle, to be his coadjutor, a step which gave great displeasure to the Emperor Francis. The matter was concluded by a treaty signed at Paris, July 12th 1806, by Talleyrand and the ministers of twelve sovereign houses of the Empire, of which the principal were the Kings of Bavaria and Würtemberg, the Elector Arch-Chancellor, the Grand Duke of Baden, and the Landgrave of Hesse Darmstadt. These princes declared themselves perpetually severed from the German Empire, and united together as "the

[25] Garden, t. ix. p. 129 sq.

Confederate States of the Rhine." The common interests of the Confederation were to be treated in a Diet to assemble at Frankfort (Art. 6). This Diet, however, never met, nor was its assembly ever invoked by any member of the league. In fact, the only aims of the confederate princes were to exempt themselves from all control, and to aggrandise themselves at the expense of their neighbours; purposes which needed not the deliberations of a Diet. Hence the Confederation, in reality, never existed; for there can be none without deliberation in common and a general law.

The Emperor of the French was proclaimed Protector of the Confederation (Art. 12). As such, he was privileged to name the successor of the Prince-Primate, to call out the contingents of the members of the Confederation, and to concur in the admission of new members. Napoleon proclaimed, by a letter of September 11th 1806, that he intended not to meddle with the internal affairs of the different States, and he kept his word; for it was, in fact, a matter of perfect indifference to him. The sole object at which he aimed was secured by Article 35, which established an alliance between the French Empire and the Confederation, binding it to make common cause with Napoleon in all his wars; an arrangement which immediately placed at his disposal near 70,000 men. The Confederation was gradually enlarged by the accession of other States up to the year 1808. They were admitted by Napoleon alone, without consulting the other members. The potentates thus subsequently admitted were the Elector of Würtzburg, the Elector of Saxony, the new King of Westphalia, the Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, the Dukes of Saxe-Weimar, Saxe-Gotha, and many minor princes. In 1810 the States composing the Confederation had a total population of between fourteen and fifteen million souls, bound to furnish contingents amounting to 120,682 men.[26] By Articles 24 and 25 of the Treaty of Confederation, the *immediate* German nobility, that is, those princes and nobles who were before subjected only to the sovereignty of the Emperor and the Empire, were now reduced under that of the princes in whose dominions their domains lay; and thus, from being subjects of the Empire, they became subjects of co-estates of the Empire. Such princes and nobles were said to be *mediatised*; a new euphemism, invented for an act of spoliation. Two of the few remaining Imperial cities, Nuremberg and Frankfort, lost their independence by the Act of Confederation; Augsburg had

[26] See Statistical Table, in Garden, t. ix. p. 279.

been placed under the dominion of Bavaria by the Peace of Presburg.

On August 1st 1806, M. Bacher, Napoleon's *chargé d'affaires* at the Diet of Ratisbon, presented a note declaring that the French Emperor no longer recognised the German Constitution, and that he had accepted the title of Protector of the Confederation of the Rhine. A declaration to the same effect was also handed in by the confederate princes. Napoleon alleged as his principal reasons for this step: that the Treaty of Presburg had placed the German courts allied with France in a condition incompatible with that of States of the Empire; that the Empire had been reduced to such a condition of weakness as to afford no protection to its subjects, and to have become only a means of dissension and discord. Thus an electorate had been suppressed by the union of Hanover with Prussia, and a northern king had incorporated with his other States a province of the Empire. This allusion referred to Gustavus IV. of Sweden, who, offended by the conduct of his Pomeranian subjects, had annulled, by a rescript of June 26th 1806, the actual constitution of his German provinces, and introduced that of Sweden.

Francis II. immediately determined to resign a crown which had long been little more than a vain ornament. He published a declaration at Vienna, August 6th 1806, to the effect that by the Confederation of the Rhine he considered himself released from all connection with the German body, and that in laying down the Imperial crown and government, he absolved the Electors, Princes, and States of the Empire from their allegiance to him. At the same time he liberated all his German provinces from their obligations towards the Empire.[27] Thus was extinguished, after a duration of more than a thousand years, the Holy Roman Empire. Francis II., the twenty-first Emperor of the House of Austria, henceforth bore the title of Francis I., Emperor of Austria.

All resistance would, indeed, have been useless, even had Francis been inclined to resist. Napoleon had retained 160,000 men in Bavaria and Suabia, who were supported at the expense of those subservient provinces. An act of the Russians afforded him a pretext for this proceeding. By the Treaty of Presburg, Istria and Dalmatia were ceded to the French; but the Montenegrins, at the instigation of the Russians, who had a squadron in the Gulf of Cattaro, descended from the mountains to prevent the French general Molitor from taking possession of Cattaro; and Baron Brody, the Austrian commandant, under the plea of compulsion,

[27] *Declaration* in Garden, t. ix. p. 140 sq. For the whole history of the Confederation, *ibid.* p. 119-284; Lefèbvre, ch. xix.

had delivered that place, together with Budna and Castel Novo, to a few Russian troops (March 4th 1806). Napoleon hereupon declared that it was for Austria to deliver to him these places agreeably to treaty; that he should not attempt to take them by force; but that meanwhile, till the treaty was fully executed, his army would continue to occupy the central provinces of Germany. In this occupation was included the Austrian town of Braunau, which the French had not yet evacuated.

Negociations for a peace between France and Russia had been going on at the same time with those already mentioned between France and England. M. d'Oubril, the Russian plenipotentiary, signed a treaty at Paris, July 20th 1806, by which it was agreed that the Russians should evacuate all the territory known as the Bocca di Cattaro; Napoleon, on his side, consenting to restore the independence of the Republic of Ragusa, which the French had seized, May 27th, and to withdraw his troops from Germany within three months after signature of the treaty. But the Emperor Alexander, alleging that M. d'Oubril had not observed his instructions, refused to ratify. The abolition of the German Empire, indeed, in the maintenance of which Russia took a great interest, made an essential alteration in the questions between that country and France. Alexander declared in a manifest addressed to his Senate, September 1st 1806, that he found himself compelled to continue the war against Napoleon.[28] Hence the Bocca di Cattaro remained in the possession of the Russians till the Peace of Tilsit, August 1807.

Napoleon's tyrannical proceedings in Germany, the extinction of the Empire, the burthens imposed upon the inhabitants for the maintenance of the French troops, excited indignation in many a bosom, even among those who had once been his admirers. Numerous articles and pamphlets were published at Nuremberg and Leipsic, painting him in the darkest colours as the oppressor of Germany, and calling on the Germans to shake off the yoke. Marshal Berthier caused Palm, a bookseller of Nuremberg, charged with selling a pamphlet entitled *Germany in its deepest Humiliation*, to be apprehended and conducted to the fortress of Braunau; where, by sentence of a court-martial, he was shot, August 26th. The sentence is said to have been founded on an opinion expressed by Napoleon, that the dissemination of libels in places occupied by the French troops, being calculated to incite the inhabitants to deeds of violence against them, was to be regarded as high treason.[29]

[28] Garden, t. ix. p. 310.

[29] "Ce n'est pas un crime ordinaire que de répandre des libelles dans un lieu où se trouvent les armées françaises, quand ces libelles provoquent à l'assassinat en insurgeant les habitants contre les troupes;

But this cruel and tyrannical act was calculated to inspire the Germans with a deeper hatred of Napoleon and the French than any pamphlets could have excited.

The Confederation of the Rhine completed another great step towards universal domination. Napoleon was now master of Italy and Dalmatia; he had humbled Austria and overturned the first throne of Christendom; he was the Protector and Dictator of a great part of Germany. A German coalition against him was no longer possible; yet, while a military monarchy like Prussia remained intact, he could hardly be said to reign in Germany. That monarchy, however, was now isolated, and it would not be difficult to crush it. The subjection of Prussia would open out new paths to Napoleon's boundless ambition. The conquest of Denmark would then be easy, and would insure that of Sweden. Russia might next submit to the yoke; and then, if even England herself could not be subjugated, a march into Asia and the destruction of her empire in that quarter might at least cease to be chimerical.[30]

The establishment of the Rhenish Confederation was at once an attack and an insult upon Prussia. Although she had the deepest interest in the matter, she had not been consulted; nay, it had been kept a profound secret from her. Contempt was thus added to perfidy. Both these were also manifested by the twenty-fourth article of the treaty, by which Frederick William's brother-in-law, the head of the House of Nassau-Orange, was *mediatised*, and one of the most illustrious princes of Europe reduced to the condition of a vassal under the plebeian Murat, the new Grand Duke of Berg.[31] By way of conciliating the King of Prussia, he was told, that if he should be inclined to unite the remaining German States into a new Confederation, and to assume the imperial crown for the House of Brandenburg, Napoleon would second the project.[32] The latter part of this offer was at once declined by Frederick William, out of consideration for the House of Austria; but he appears to have joyfully accepted the idea of a new Confederation, and to have made some advances in that way to the Electors

c'est un crime de haute trahison." Dumas ap. Wachsmuth, *Gesch. Frankreichs im Revolutionszeitalter*, B. iii. S. 400; Menzel, B. vi. S. 470.

[30] That Napoleon really entertained projects of this sort, appears from Count Stadion's revelations of his confidential communications. See Garden, t. ix. p. 286.

[31] *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 167.

[32] Letter of Talleyrand to Laforêt, the French ambassador at Berlin, July 22nd. Lefèbvre, ch. xx. Laforêt made the proposition to the Cabinet of Berlin only verbally and with some alteration in the terms. Thus, instead of saying that Napoleon would *second* it, he only said that he would *not oppose it*. *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 172 sq.

of Saxony and Hesse-Cassel, and to the Dukes of Mecklenburg. Napoleon, however, was not sincere in these overtures. The French Government took care to excite the suspicions of the Court of Dresden respecting the intentions of Prussia. The Elector of Hesse was openly menaced with the loss of Hanau if he should accede to the rival Confederation, while the principality of Fulda was held out to him as a bait for joining that of the Rhine. The towns of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck received imperious orders not to enter the Prussian league, though Napoleon had no right to dictate to those cities.[33] Napoleon's unfriendly intentions were also displayed by other measures. Marshal Bernadotte was ordered to occupy Nuremberg, and to advance towards the frontiers of Prussia and Saxony. The fortress of Wesel, on the right bank of the Rhine, was seized and incorporated with the department of the Roer. The Abbeys of Verden, Elten, and Essen, in Westphalia, were also seized by Murat. A large force was assembled on the Ems; the Duchy of Berg was inundated with troops, and the western frontier of Prussia appeared to be surrounded.

It is possible, however, that Frederick William III. might have overlooked these injuries and insults, but for another, which filled up the measure of them. It will be recollected that negociations for a peace were at this time going on between England and France. Lord Yarmouth, the English plenipotentiary at Paris, whether carelessly or purposely, let out the secret over his wine, that the restoration of Hanover to England was to be one of the conditions of it. Lucchesini, the Prussian Minister at the Court of the Tuileries, immediately conveyed this piece of intelligence to his government, who received it August 7th. The effect was magical. When Frederick William learned that Napoleon intended to deprive him of the Electorate which he had received in order to avert the French Emperor's wrath, and which he looked upon as the price of his dishonour, his grief and rage knew no bounds. The news soon got abroad, and produced a like effect upon the people. It was, in fact, the immediate cause of the war that ensued. The Prussian Ministers affected to attribute their indignation solely to the perfidy of the French Government, in threatening to deprive them of a country which it had forced them to accept; but it is certain that the King and many leading personages had thrown a covetous eye upon Hanover, and that they were exceedingly sorry to be deprived of it.[34] The relinquish-

[33] *Homme d'état*, p. 174 sq.

[34] This appears from the confession of Lucchesini to the celebrated Prussian publicist, M. Gentz. See Gentz's *Mém. du mois d'Octobre*, in Garden, t. x. p. 354.

ment of it was, however, now become necessary, in order to make their peace with England.

Napoleon affirmed that he was driven into the Prussian war; that it had not entered into his calculations. But it appears from the correspondence of his foreign office, that the overthrow of Prussia had been contemplated since November 1805;[35] his measures were well calculated to provoke a war, and the retaining of his troops in Germany to carry it on with speed and success. On the other hand, Prussia chose an unfortunate moment to commence it. She had already devoured many insults, and if she could have digested those now offered to her but half a year, she might probably have found herself supported by another coalition. But a violent war party had arisen, at the head of which was the beautiful and spirited Queen, the King's cousin, Prince Louis, and many of the leading statesmen and generals of the kingdom; and the melancholy and irresolute Frederick William found himself unable to resist the warlike ardour of his court and people. Another motive seems also to have operated with his ministry. Prussia was in a state of isolation. She had lost the confidence of Europe, and any propositions for support and alliance would not have been listened to, unless she first proved her sincerity by a war.[36]

A day or two after it was known in Berlin that Napoleon contemplated the restoration of Hanover to England, the Prussian army was ordered to be placed on a war footing. Before commencing the war, it was necessary for Prussia to disembarrass herself of the enemies which her alliance with France had brought upon her. A reconciliation was effected with the King of Sweden, August 17th. Diplomatic relations were renewed with the English Government, and Lord Howick, who had succeeded Fox as foreign minister, announced, September 25th, the raising of the blockade of the Elbe, the Weser, and the Ems. Lord Morpeth was despatched a few days after to negociate a treaty. On his arrival at Berlin, the King and Queen of Prussia had already set off for the army. He found them at Weimar, October 12th. A great battle was then impending, and Haugwitz would settle nothing with the English ambassador till it had been decided. The King of Prussia, it is said, if his arms should be successful, was resolved to keep Hanover; in the other event, to exchange it for the alliance and subsidies of England.[37] As a last attempt to avert a

[35] Garden, t. x. p. 8.

[36] See the confession of the Marquis Lucchesini, ap. Gentz, ubi suprà, p. 368.

[37] *Mémoires* de Gentz; Lefèbvre, ch. xxii. A treaty of peace between Great Britain and Prussia was signed at Memel,

war, which Frederick William viewed with increasing dread as it became more imminent, General Knobelsdorf was despatched to Paris early in September to attempt a renewal of negociations. When the Prussian ultimatum of September 25th arrived, Napoleon was already at Bamberg, superintending the march of his army (October 7th). It demanded the immediate evacuation of Germany by the French troops; that France should not oppose a league of North Germany to embrace all the States not comprised in the Confederation of the Rhine; the opening, without delay, of a negociation to arrange all matters still in dispute; with the basis, for Prussia, of the separation of Wesel from the French Empire, and the re-occupation of the Abbeys of Elten, Essen, and Verden, by the Prussian troops.[38] Frederick William could hardly have imagined that such an ultimatum would be accepted; and it can, therefore, only be regarded as a declaration of war.

Such a declaration was formally issued, October 8th. Prussia had thus committed herself irrevocably to a struggle with all the might of France, without the hope of any timely succour. Frederick William had delayed to apply to the Emperor Alexander for aid till he had received his first despatch from Knobelsdorf, September 18th. A promise of assistance was frankly given by the Russian Emperor; but it was now impossible that his troops should arrive on the scene of action before the end of November. Application had also been made in a somewhat humble and supplicatory tone to the Emperor of Austria, but met with a refusal. Prussia was now repaid in her own coin. Her only ally was Saxony, and that a forced one. Prince Hohenlohe had invaded that country, compelled the Court of Dresden to declare for Prussia, and enlisted under her banner the Saxon army of 18,000 men. The Elector of Hesse-Cassel maintained his neutrality, with the view of joining the winning side.

The Prussian army consisted of about 180,000 men; good troops, no doubt, but of which only a small portion had seen any actual service. The King had intrusted the command-in-chief to the Duke of Brunswick, now upwards of seventy years of age, whose military reputation dated from the Seven Years' War. His campaigns against the French had not been such as to add to his renown; but nobody was in a better position than the Court of Berlin to determine whether his failures had been owing to military or political causes. The rest of the Prussian *état major* was also

Jan. 28th 1807, after Frederick William's terrible reverses, by which he agreed to restore Hanover. But subsequent events rendered this treaty null. Garden, t. x. p. 191.

[38] Garden, t. x. p. 16; Lefèbvre, ch. xxi.

for the most part composed of old men; as Marshal Möllendorf, Prince Hohenlohe, Gneisenau, Blücher, Kalkreuth; though Blücher, at more than sixty years of age, still retained all the fire and energy of youth. The army of France, superior in number to that of Prussia, was reinforced by a contingent of 25,000 men from the Rhenish Confederation. The Emperor of Austria's brother, the Archduke Ferdinand, had been compelled to join the League, September 25th. Thus this unfortunate prince, after being successively driven from Tuscany and Salzburg, was reduced for his new principality of Wurtzburg to become the ally of the man who had inflicted on his house the grossest insults and injuries. The French, commanded by Bonaparte in person, and his best generals, Bernadotte, Lannes, Davoust, Ney, Soult, Augereau, Lefèbvre, were already in Germany. But Brunswick, thinking that they were dispersed in Franconia, and not yet prepared to take the offensive, formed the plan of falling suddenly upon their dispersed divisions from the hills and forests of Thuringia. With this view he concentrated his centre at Erfurt, extended his right wing beyond Gotha towards Eisenach, while his left was placed between Jena and Blankenheim. But the Duke neither knew the true position of the French, nor allowed for the eagle's eye and the eagle's swoop of Napoleon. By October 8th the French army was already assembled at the foot of the Fichtelgebirge, which separates the valley of the Main from that of the Saale. Napoleon had determined to repeat the grand manœuvre which he had performed with such wonderful success at Marengo and Ulm. Brunswick's position exposed his left to be turned, his communications with the Saale and the Elbe to be intercepted; and thus his retreat to be cut off, and his junction with the Russians prevented. The French advanced in three columns. On the right, the corps of Soult and Ney marched by Hof upon Plauen; on the left, Lannes and Augereau debouched from Coburg upon Grafenthal and Saalfeld; the centre, with Murat and the Imperial Guard, and the corps of Davoust and Bernadotte, took the direction of Lobenstein along the high road between Bamberg and Leipsic. Further on the same road, at the little town of Gera, all the three columns were to form a junction. Brunswick, on discovering this movement, instead of securing the bridges over the Saale, concentrated his forces at Weimar, as if to await a battle there. Bernadotte, having defeated a Prussian corps at Schleitz, October 9th, continued his march towards Gera. On the following day, Lannes, with the French left, obtained a still more important victory over the Prussians at Saalfeld. In this battle Prince Louis was killed in a single combat with Guindet, a

French *maréchal des logis*. On the 12th, Napoleon had established his headquarters at Gera. Hence Davoust and Murat with the light cavalry were despatched to seize Naumburg and the bridge of Kösen, thus cutting off the Prussian line of retreat from Weimar to Berlin; while Bernadotte was directed upon Dornburg. From Gera, Napoleon addressed a letter to Frederick William, which seems to have been rather intended as a *ruse de guerre* to frighten him and throw him off his guard, than as a sincere offer of conciliation. At the same time Napoleon directed his main body towards the left, hoping to envelope the Prussians at Jena.

After the check at Saalfeld, Prince Hohenlohe and the greater part of the Prussian generals had expressed their opinion that no time should be lost in repassing the Saale, and retiring behind the Elbe. But the Duke of Brunswick took three days to decide. Meanwhile Naumburg had been seized, his left turned, and his army placed in the same situation as that of Mélas at Marengo, and Mack at Ulm. It was not till he heard that some of the French forces were marching upon Leipsic, quite in his rear, that he began to understand the true nature of his position. Now, at last, when it was too late, he began to move. The King and the Duke of Brunswick, with 65,000 men, the *élite* of the army, and the most distinguished generals, Möllendorf, Blücher, Schmettau, Kalkreuth, the Prince of Orange, the Princes Henry and William of Prussia, directed their march on Freiburg, by Auerstädt and Naumburg; the remainder, including the Saxons, under the command of Prince Hohenlohe, were left behind at JENA to cover the retreat. Here they were entirely defeated by Napoleon in person, with much superior forces, October 14th, and compelled to retreat beyond Weimar behind the Ilm. On the same day the King of Prussia and Brunswick fell in with Davoust at AUERSTÄDT, where they experienced a still more signal defeat, though the French forces scarcely numbered more than half the Prussians.[39] In this fatal day, Brunswick was soon disabled by a wound in the forehead; Möllendorf, who succeeded him in the command, was also mortally wounded. Frederick William, uninformed of the battle of Jena, ordered a retreat upon Weimar; but the flying troops fell in near Apolda with Bernadotte's van. Here also they learned that Weimar was occupied by the French. Now commenced a disorderly flight,

[39] It is plain that the victory at Auerstädt was both much more glorious and more important than that at Jena; yet because Napoleon gained the latter, he caused both to be called by its name, thus defrauding Davoust of his due merit. The two battles were entirely distinct, and fought at a distance of eighteen miles. Napoleon did not even know the direction taken by the King of Prussia and Brunswick, but thought that he had surprised the whole Prussian army at Jena.

the horror and confusion of which was soon augmented by falling in with the fugitives of Jena. A great part of the army dispersed itself: a portion, with which was the King, retreated by Sommerda to Sondershausen; at which place Frederick William arrived October 16th, escorted by a regiment of guards and a battalion of grenadiers. Thence, after a sojourn of a few hours, he set off for his northern provinces, leaving the command to Prince Hohenlohe, with instructions to make Magdeburg the rallying point.

The loss of the Prussians in these two battles is variously estimated, but at the least may be stated at 30,000 men, killed, wounded, or captured, with almost all their guns and magazines. Those who had escaped were in a state of complete demoralization. The Prussian monarchy lay at Napoleon's mercy. From Sommerda, Frederick William had written to the French Emperor to propose an armistice, who rejected it with the remark that he must first of all gather the fruits of his victories.

Murat, Soult, and Ney were despatched after the Prussians, who were retreating upon Magdeburg; Davoust and Lannes were directed on Wittenberg and Dessau, *en route* for Berlin; Bernadotte on Halle, into which the Prince of Würtemberg had thrown himself with 16,000 men, and whence he was driven with great slaughter, October 17th. Murat and Ney had appeared at Erfurt on the 15th, where they took 14,000 prisoners, 120 guns, and large magazines. Among the captured were four wounded generals: the Prince of Orange, Grawert, Zweiffel, and Field-Marshal Möllendorf; the last expired soon after. Napoleon dismissed all his Saxon prisoners, in number 6000. This act had the effect intended. On the 23rd of October the Elector announced that he had separated his arms from those of Prussia, and proclaimed his neutrality.

Napoleon arrived at Potsdam, October 24th. Here he visited the tomb of Frederick the Great. Had anything been capable of awakening in his breast a generous sympathy, it might, one would think, have been the remains of a sovereign who among all modern conquerors most resembled himself. But Napoleon had no feeling except for what he considered to be his own glory. The sword, the cordon of the Black Eagle, even the sash and stock of the Prussian hero, were seized, and sent as trophies to the *Invalides* at Paris. Napoleon entered Berlin October 27th, and was received with the acclamations of the populace. A twelvemonth had not elapsed since he had also occupied Vienna as a conqueror. The wounded Duke of Brunswick wrote to Napoleon, imploring mercy for his subjects. The conqueror, in his reply,

styled him only *General* Brunswick, refused to recognise him as a sovereign, overwhelmed him with bitter reproaches, which, even had they been just, should not have been uttered at such a moment to a vanquished and dying enemy. To escape such ruthless hands, the Duke fled from his capital in the direction of Altona. Anguish and fatigue put an end to his life at Oltensee. He expired in the arms of his son, who vowed to avenge him, and who, by a just retribution, before many years had passed was baiting the tyrant in his own lair.

Prince Hohenlohe, with the remnant of the royal army, made no stay at Magdeburg, but, hoping to reach Stettin and the Oder before the French, rapidly directed his march on that place by way of Rathenau, Ruppin, and Prenzlow. But at Zehdenick, where the road is crossed by that from Berlin through Oranienburg, the Prussian advanced guard was overtaken and defeated by Murat and his cavalry. Murat, closely followed by Lannes, then hastened on to Prenzlow; and when Hohenlohe arrived at that place, October 28th, he found it occupied by the French. Some proposed to cut their way through, but the enterprise was clearly too desperate; and the Prince, after a short conference with Murat, surrendered at discretion. This division consisted of 16,000 foot, six regiments of cavalry, and 64 guns: the last considerable remains of the Prussian army. There were, however, still some dispersed corps. Of these, two were compelled to surrender at Pasewalk and Anklam. More to the North were Blücher, with a large body of cavalry, and a division under General Winning. Blücher learned at Boitzemburg the occupation of Prenzlow by the French, and, finding the road to Stettin thus intercepted, resolved to make for Stralsund. Having formed a junction with Winning, he found himself in command of about 20,000 men. But the active Murat, with his accustomed celerity, had occupied Demmin, cut off the road to Stralsund, and advanced upon Gustrow. Blücher being also pressed in other directions by the advance of Soult and Bernadotte, had no resource but to seize the neutral town of Lübeck, November 5th, and to maintain himself there a day or two, till he should have embarked his troops, and so gained the Baltic. But on the night of the 5th, the columns of all his pursuers entered the town in different directions. Blücher, after an heroic resistance, effected his escape to the left bank of the Trave, whilst Lübeck was subjected to all the horrors and excesses of a sack. But the Prussian general was surrounded, his escape hopeless, and, on the 7th of November, he was obliged to surrender himself prisoner with all his division.

Thus was completed in less than a month the annihilation of that numerous and well-appointed army.

Several strong fortresses still remained to be reduced, but a panic seems to have seized the Prussian soldiery, and they were surrendered with a haste which does little credit to their commandants. Stettin, with a garrison of 6000 men, 150 guns, and provisions for a long siege, capitulated at the first summons, October 29th. Cüstrin, an almost impregnable place on an island of the Oder, surrendered to a detachment of light cavalry, November 1st. Magdeburg on the Elbe, the chief fortress of the Prussian monarchy, with a garrison of 20,000 men, after a blockade of a fortnight, surrendered at discretion to Ney, who had only about 10,000 men, and was destitute of siege artillery, November 8th. In this place were found near 800 guns and immense magazines. Several smaller places capitulated in the like disgraceful manner. The surrender of these places rendered the French masters of the Elbe and the Oder, and may be said to have terminated the campaign. Never had a great monarchy fallen so rapidly and so shamefully. Prussia was subdued morally as well as physically; the courage of its defenders was broken and extinguished.

Hesse-Cassel, Swedish Pomerania, the principality of Fulda, the Hanseatic Towns, the Duchies of Mecklenburg and Brunswick, condemned as more or less concerned in the Prussian cause, were occupied by the division of Marshal Mortier. A paragraph in the *Moniteur* announced soon after that the Elector of Hesse had ceased to reign. It remained to reduce the fortresses of Silesia; Glogau, Breslau, Brieg, Neisse, Schweidnitz, Glatz. This operation was intrusted to the troops of the Rhenish Confederation, under Prince Jerôme and General Vandamme. The commandants of most of these places distinguished themselves by a resistance which contrasted strongly with that of the Prussian towns; most of them were eventually reduced.

While the French were advancing in their irresistible career, Frederick William III. was flying towards the eastern frontiers of his kingdom. From Cüstrin he had addressed a letter to Napoleon, October 25th, with offers of peace and friendship, and promises to send back the Russian army. But Napoleon's demands increased with his success. Although the Prussian plenipotentiaries notified their acceptance of the terms previously offered by Napoleon at Wittenberg, their note remained unanswered; nor did a second letter from Frederick William, from Graudenz, alter his determination. Lucchesini and General Zastrow, the Prussian negociators,

now endeavoured to obtain an armistice; which Napoleon granted, but on terms which he knew could not be accepted. They involved the occupation by the French of the Prussian provinces on the right bank of the Vistula, and the surrender to them of Thorn, Graudenz, Dantzic, Colberg, Glogau, Breslau, Hameln, and Neuburg; none of which places had at that time capitulated.[40] Indeed, Talleyrand plainly told the plenipotentiaries that the Emperor was not disposed to make a separate peace with Prussia; that France, and Spain and Holland, her allies, had lost many of their colonies; that it was only just that the French conquests should serve to regain some of these possessions. Thus the successes of England were to compensate the reverses of Prussia. Napoleon publicly announced this to be his policy in a message to the Senate, November 21st.

Lucchesini and Zastrow, however, signed this capitulation at Charlottenburg, November 16th; but the King refused to ratify. In fact he was no longer in a condition to do so without the consent of the Emperor Alexander, whose troops now occupied part of the territories demanded by Napoleon. Napoleon, rejoicing at Frederick William's determination, applied himself to raise an insurrection in Prussian Poland, fixed his headquarters at Posen, November 24th, pushed forward his army to the Vistula, and with the view of inciting the Poles, caused a letter to be forged in the name of Kosciuszko, calling them to arms. But the Polish patriot, faithful to the oath which he had given to the Emperor Paul, refused all Napoleon's solicitations and offers to engage him in the insurrection, and publicly disavowed the letter attributed to him. General Dombrowski, however, one of Kosciuszko's former associates, took an active part in organising an insurrection. A national administration was everywhere substituted for that of Prussia, and a deputation waited upon the French Emperor to supplicate the re-establishment of Poland. But Napoleon had no such intention. His measures were intended only to aid him against Russia and Prussia, and to enable him to raise for that purpose two regiments of Polish patriots.[41]

[40] Martens, t. viii. p. 560.

[41] *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 414. See also Napoleon's instructions to General Andréossy, ap. Lefèbvre, ch. xxii.

CHAPTER XIII.

WHILST Napoleon was at Posen he concluded a peace with Frederick Augustus, Elector of Saxony, who had only by compulsion taken arms against the French. By this treaty, signed December 11th 1806, the Elector was created KING OF SAXONY, and agreed to enter into the Confederation of the Rhine.[1]

The French were now to encounter a new enemy. The Russian army of about 73,000 foot and 16,000 horse, under the command-in-chief of Field-marshal Kamenskoï, had entered Prussian Poland about the middle of November. Several affairs occurred between the French and Russians before the end of the year, and especially a double battle at Pultusk and Golymin, December 26th. Both sides claimed the victory, which seems, however, really to have been in favour of the French. At all events Kamenskoï now resigned the command, and Bennigsen, who succeeded him, found it necessary to retire upon his reserves at Lomza. These affairs, however, in which the French suffered very severely, were attended by no important results, although Napoleon, in his mendacious bulletins,[2] claimed the most decisive advantages. Both armies then went into winter quarters for a few weeks; but operations were resumed before the end of January 1807. Bennigsen advanced with the view of raising the blockade of the Prussian fortresses on the Lower Vistula; a movement which produced a series of indecisive combats. The most important of these was the battle of Eylau,[3] February 8th, at which Napoleon was present. The Russians were attacked in their position behind Eylau by the divisions of Davoust, Soult, Ney, Augereau, and by the cavalry of Murat. The loss was enormous on both sides. Napoleon, as usual, claimed a splendid and decisive victory; but the facts appear to be that the Russians remained in possession of the field; that Bennigsen did not begin his retreat towards the Pregel till three days afterwards, unmolested by the French; that Napoleon then advanced,

[1] Martens, t. viii. p. 552.

[2] Those of Napoleon became so notorious for this quality, that the French soldiers themselves adopted the phrase, *mentir comme un bulletin.*

[3] *Prussian* Eylau, 20 or 30 miles south of Königsberg.

and took possession for a few days of Eylau; but instead of pursuing the Russians, finally retired behind the Passarge.[4] Eylau was one of those battles in which Napoleon pitilessly sacrificed his men in that reckless manner which caused Kléber to call him *Général à 6000 hommes par jour*. His loss was so great that it has been thought, if the Russians had advanced on the following day, the French army would have been exterminated.

The real state of the case may be best inferred from Napoleon's acts. After the battle of Eylau he sent General Bertrand to Bennigsen with pacific overtures; but the Russian general bluntly replied, "that his master had not sent him to negociate, but to fight." Bertrand then repaired to the King of Prussia, at Memel, with a letter from Napoleon proposing a separate peace; but received a vague and evasive answer.[5] Active operations in the field were not resumed till towards the end of May, though the sieges of the Prussian fortresses went on. In this interval the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia concluded the Convention of Bartenstein, April 26th 1807, which was in fact, when it was now too late, the revival of Pitt's plan in 1805 for a general European coalition against France. This Convention shows to what an extent the battle of Eylau had revived the hopes of Alexander and Frederick William. Great Britain acceded to the Convention, and in the following June Mr. Canning, then foreign secretary, signed a treaty with Prussia, granting a subsidy of a million sterling; but the Peace of Tilsit, which ensued soon after, prevented this treaty from taking effect. On April 29th, Napoleon made another attempt to open a negociation with the King of Prussia, but without success.

Dantzic capitulated to Marshal Lefèbvre, May 24th, who was rewarded with the title of Duke of Dantzic. The surrender of this place having liberated 30,000 French troops, and Napoleon having also obtained large reinforcements from other quarters, offensive operations were resumed; and in the first half of June, several actions, of more or less importance, occurred between the French and Russian armies. On the 14th was fought the decisive battle of Friedland, a town on the Alle. Bennigsen had repulsed Lannes and Mortier, and towards midday his army was disbanding, when, in the afternoon, Napoleon in person, with his guards, and the corps of Ney and Victor, came up, and inflicted an immense loss on the unprepared Russians. The result of this battle was the occupation, by Soult, of Königsberg, the capital of Prussia,

[4] Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 162 sqq. [5] Lefèbvre, ch. xxiii.

June 16th. After the battle of Friedland, Lestocq had marched out with the garrison, and joined the combined Russian and Prussian army, which crossed the Niemen, at Tilsit, on the night of June 18th. Napoleon entered Tilsit on the following day.

The Russians now made proposals for a suspension of arms, to which Napoleon consented, June 21st, on condition that it should be employed in negociating a peace. The King of Prussia had thus no alternative but to submit to the conditions of the conqueror, and on the 25th, another armistice was signed between the Prussians and French. The fortresses of Colberg, Graudenz, and Pillau, and a few in Silesia, had not yet been reduced, and it was agreed that matters should remain as they were till the peace.[6]

On the 25th of June took place the celebrated interview between Alexander and Napoleon on a raft, moored in the middle of the Niemen. The reconciliation of the two Emperors is said to have been founded on mutual hatred of England.[7] Alexander conceived that he had some just causes of complaint against the English Government. The Whig ministry, which held office during the struggle between France and the two Northern Powers, had refused, and in no very civil terms, Alexander's application to them, to guarantee a Russian loan of six millions sterling, or to make a diversion, by landing troops in the North of Europe, in Holland, or on the coasts of France. But, at all events, Alexander's hatred of England was not very profound or lasting; for, notwithstanding the Peace of Tilsit, and the invectives which, to please Napoleon, he uttered against the English, one of his officers proceeded to London to reassure the Cabinet of St. James's, and testify his admiration.[8] The Whigs, indeed, had then gone out of office, and Canning had replaced Lord Howick (afterwards Earl Grey) in the Foreign Office.

A second interview between the two Emperors took place on the Niemen, June 26th, at which the King of Prussia was also present. Negociations for a peace were now begun; Tilsit was declared neutral, and that obscure little town was enlivened by the presence of three sovereigns. The Queen of Prussia had also come thither, hoping, perhaps, to mollify the victor by her beauty and fascinations. But, at the same time, she forgot not her dignity, which seems to have offended the coarse-minded conqueror; for Napoleon was wholly destitute of generosity and elevation of mind, and would, perhaps, have granted to base and abject supplication that which he denied to conscious majesty in distress. Alexander and

[6] For these armistices see Martens, t. viii. p. 633 sqq.

[7] Lefèbvre, ch. xxiv.

[8] Garden, t. x. p. 214, note.

Napoleon lived together a fortnight in the closest intimacy, settling between them the partition of the world. The arrangements for peace, thus discussed between the principals, instead of their diplomatic agents, though these were also present, were soon brought to a termination. The Peace of Tilsit, between France and Russia, was concluded July 7th, and ratified on the 9th.[9] Napoleon accepted the mediation of Alexander for a peace with England; the Emperor of Russia recognised Joseph Bonaparte as King of Naples, Louis Bonaparte as King of Holland, the Confederation of the Rhine, and the states and titles of the different sovereigns composing it; also, the new kingdom of Westphalia, to be erected in favour of Jerôme Bonaparte. As a war was then raging between Russia and Turkey, to which we shall allude further on, Alexander consented to accept the mediation of France between the two Empires, and to withdraw his troops from Moldavia and Wallachia, which they had occupied.

The treaty also regulated the affairs of Prussia (Art. 4–9). Talleyrand had at first proposed that Prussia should be blotted out from the European system, and it appears to have been only at the intercession of the Russian Emperor that Frederick William III. was allowed to preserve his crown. He was, however, deprived of nearly half his kingdom. He was compelled to renounce all his possessions between the Elbe and the Rhine; to cede the circle of Cotbus in Lusatia to the King of Saxony; and to abandon all his Polish possessions, including Dantzic, with the exception of Warmia, or Ermeland, and a part of the district of Netze. All the rest of Prussian Poland, with the title of Grand Duchy of Warsaw, was to be transferred to the King of Saxony. To connect these possessions, the King of Saxony was to have a military road through the Prussian territories; a stipulation evidently made in the interests of France. Thus a new sovereign and a constitution, drawn up in a few hours by Talleyrand, agreeably to the interests of Napoleon and the Emperor of Russia, were all that the Poles obtained by their rebellion.[10] The new duchy was, however, designed as a standing menace against Russia; as a centre whence, in case of need, rebellion might be spread into the other provinces of Poland.[11] Dantzic, with a territory of ten leagues in circumference, was to be restored to its ancient independence, under the protection of Prussia and Saxony. The province in East Prussia, called the department of Bialystock, was made over to Russia. The treaty between Prussia and France, signed July 9th,[12] was little more than

[9] Martens, t. viii. p. 637.
[10] *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 448.
[11] Lefèbvre, ch. xxiv.
[12] Martens, t. viii. p. 646.

a repetition and ratification of the conditions in the Russian treaty. Frederick William recognised the Kingdom of Westphalia, formed out of the provinces ceded by himself, and of others, as Hesse-Cassel, the duchy of Brunswick, &c., which were in the possession of Napoleon. All the Prussian ports were to be shut against the English. No English vessel was to be admitted into them, no Prussian vessel was to sail for England.

Frederick William III., in a proclamation dated at Memel, July 24th, took a farewell of the subjects of whom he had been deprived, with the exception of the Poles who had risen against him. The sacrifices imposed upon him were severe, the humiliation deep but not altogether undeserved. Prussia had prepared her own ruin by the selfish policy which she had pursued during the last ten or twelve years—a policy rendered more deplorable by the vacillation and timidity of the reigning monarch. Nevertheless, Napoleon's treatment of Prussia, like most measures of compromise, was a great political mistake. He should either by his generosity have made her a firm friend, or have deprived her of the power of ever avenging her humiliation.

The burthens imposed upon Prussia were not confined to those named in the treaty. The French generals and administrators compelled Frederick William to pay 140 million francs; to deliver up, by way of securing the payment, the fortresses of Glogau, Cüstrin, and Stettin, and to support in them at his own expense a French corps of 10,000 men. He was also obliged to undertake that, during the next ten years, he would not keep on foot more than 42,000 regular troops.[13]

To the patent treaties were annexed certain separate and secret articles,[14] of great importance; stipulating that the Bocca di Cattaro should be transferred to the French troops; that the Ionian Isles should be possessed by Napoleon; that Alexander should recognise Joseph Bonaparte as King of the Two Sicilies—he had already recognised him as King of Naples—so soon as the Neapolitan Bourbons should be compensated with the Balearic Isles or the Island of Candia. Prussia engaged to make common cause with France, if England should not, by December 1st 1807, consent to an honourable peace and one conformable to the true principles of maritime law.

A secret treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive, was also concluded between France and Russia. Those Powers agreed in all circumstances to employ their arms together. The alliance

[13] *Homme d'état*, t. ix. p. 455.

[14] These are not given by Martens. See Garden, t. x. p. 234 sqq.

was to be particularly applicable to Great Britain and Turkey; but first of all Russia was to mediate with the former Power, France with the latter. If England refused Russian mediation, or if, having accepted it, she did not, by November 1st, consent to conclude a peace, recognising the perfect independence of all flags, and restoring to France and her allies the conquests she had made since 1805, then Russia was to notify to the English Government that she would make common cause with France. If the English Cabinet did not give a satisfactory answer by December 1st, then France and Russia were to summon the Courts of Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Lisbon to shut their ports against the English, and declare war against them. Austria was to be urged to adopt the same resolution. If England accepted the conditions offered, then Hanover was to be restored in compensation for the French, Dutch, and Spanish colonies. In like manner, if the Porte refused to listen to French mediation, then France was to make common cause with Russia.

Another secret treaty in ten articles is also said to have been executed by the two Emperors at Tilsit. These articles, which comprise in fact little less than a partition of the world, seem almost too extravagant for belief. Turkey in Europe was to be assigned to Russia, with any further conquests she might make on the side of Asia; a prince of Napoleon's family was to become master of Spain and Portugal; the temporal authority of the Pope was to be destroyed, and the Roman States were to be annexed to the Kingdom of Italy; the French were to occupy Tunis, Algiers, Malta, and Egypt; the Mediterranean was to be navigated only by French, Russian, Spanish, and Italian vessels; Denmark was to resign her fleet to France, and was to be compensated with the Hanseatic Towns and some territories in Germany; no Power which did not possess a certain number of ships of the line was to have merchant vessels at sea.

The following arrangements were also made between Alexander and Napoleon: in case Sweden and Portugal should refuse to comply with that article of the treaty of alliance calling upon them to shut their ports against England, then Russia was to take Finland in compensation for the war she would have to wage against Sweden; whilst Napoleon would come to an understanding with Spain about Portugal, and would send a French army to Lisbon. If the two Powers should make war upon Turkey in consequence of her refusal of French mediation, then Russia was to have Moldavia, Wallachia, and Bulgaria as far as the left bank of the Maritza; but in no case would Russia be allowed to possess Con-

stantinople. Bosnia and Servia were to be assigned to Austria; while France was to take Albania, Epirus, the Peloponnesus, Attica, and Thessaly, or the maritime provinces. An expedition against the English possessions in India was also discussed; but on this subject no decisive stipulations were made.[15]

Such was the grand scheme for the partition of the world, in which Napoleon reserved for himself the lion's share.[16] However extravagant it may seem, and although the documents which contain it have never been published in a formal and authentic manner,[17] it is, nevertheless, now received as an historical truth. Many of the parts of it have been indirectly confirmed. The substance has been given by Lefèbvre, who, as Director of the French Department for Foreign Affairs, had the best means of information.[18] That part which relates to Spain has been confirmed by the Duke de Rovigo, in his *Mémoires*.[19] The French foreign minister, in a letter addressed to the Russian Chancellor, Count Roumantsof, April 12th (1812), reminds him of the Emperor Alexander's engagement at Tilsit, to call upon the Courts of Copenhagen, Stockholm, and Lisbon to shut their ports and declare war against England, if she would not consent to a peace on terms of maritime equality.[20] The plan for dividing the Turkish Empire is proved by a Report, addressed to Napoleon by Savary, afterwards Duke of Rovigo, his envoy extraordinary at St. Petersburg, a few months after the Peace of Tilsit.[21]

By the events just related, Napoleon appeared to have established an absolute domination over the Continent. Russia, the only Power at all capable of counterbalancing his designs, had agreed to participate in them. Prussia was reduced to the condition of a second-rate Power, and Austria had also been weakened and discouraged. The greater part of Germany was subjected to France by means of the Confederation of the Rhine and the Kingdom of Westphalia. French Princes ruled in Italy and Holland. The other continental

[15] Garden, t. x. pp. 238—242.

[16] A French author thus characterises these arrangements: "Mettant de côté toute finesse diplomatique on s'explique franchement, *comme des chefs de bandes sur un partage de butin !*"— Thibaudeau, *L'Empire*, t. iii. p. 222.

[17] The Articles of the Treaty of Partition were first published, but incorrectly, in the *Biographie Univ.*, art. *Alexandre*, t. lvi. Supp. They will also be found in Schnitzler, *Secret Hist. of Russia*, vol. i. App. p. 398, and in Garden, *loc. cit.*

[18] *Hist. des Cabinets de l'Europe*, t. iii. p. 113 sq.

[19] Vol. iii. Napoleon, in his conversation with the Canon Escoiquiz said: "L'Empereur de Russie, auquel j'ai fait part à Tilsitt, de mes projets sur l'Espagne, qui remontent à cette époque, les approuva, et j'ai reçu sa parole d'honneur qu'il ne s'y opposerait pas."—*Exposé des Motifs, &c.*, par Don Juan Escoiquiz, p. 131.

[20] *Moniteur Universel*, de 8 Juillet, 1812, ap. Garden, t. x. p. 243.

[21] *Ibid.* pp. 243—253.

States were incapable of any effective resistance. England alone still proudly raised her head among the subjugated nations, holding out to them the hope of eventual deliverance, and bidding defiance to all the power of the tyrant. Whilst he was enjoying his triumphs, an order of the British Government had declared all the ports of the French Empire blockaded, from Brest to the Elbe (May 16th 1806). It was evident that either he or England must perish. With this conviction, Napoleon resorted to what has been called the CONTINENTAL SYSTEM; which, as England was mistress of the seas, was in fact nothing less than a prohibition of all commerce, and a struggle with nature herself, in which he could not but eventually succumb. It was to carry out this system that, in spite of the protests of his Senate, and the public voice of France, which called for peace, he refused to set bounds to his conquests, and proceeded to occupy with his armies the coasts of the Baltic and the North Sea.

Napoleon's first step towards the Continental System was the celebrated BERLIN DECREE, of November 21st 1806. By this decree the British Isles were declared in a state of blockade; all commerce and correspondence with them were forbidden; all letters addressed to Englishmen, or written in English, were to be seized; every British subject, of whatever state or condition, that should be found in countries occupied by the French troops, was to be made a prisoner of war; all merchandise coming from England, or her colonies, or belonging to an Englishman, was to be confiscated, and all trading in such merchandise was prohibited; no vessels coming directly from England, or the English colonies, or that had visited them after the publication of this Decree, were to be received in any port.[22]

Such were the main features of this extraordinary manifest, which was nothing less than the proscription of England from the pale of European society and fellowship, so far, at least, as the power of Napoleon should extend. It was followed up during the remainder of his reign by other decrees of a like kind. Thus a decree, dated Warsaw, January 25th 1807, ordered the confiscation of all English or colonial merchandise seized in the Hanse Towns. The decree of Fontainebleau, of October 19th 1810, carried the system to its highest pitch, and almost bears the marks of insanity. It ordained that all English manufactures that should now, or in future, be found in France, in Holland, in the Grand Duchy of Berg, in the Hanse Towns, and, generally, in Germany, from the

[22] Garden, t. x. p. 305.

Main to the sea, in the Kingdom of Italy, in the Illyrian provinces, in the Kingdom of Naples, in the Spanish provinces occupied by the French troops, or in any towns within their reach, should be publicly burnt.[23] The Princes of the Rhenish Confederation hastened, with a base subserviency, to execute this commercial *auto-da-fé*, at the expense of their own merchants; and, as Frankfort manifested some reluctance, French troops were sent thither to carry out the will of the despot.

France justified these measures as just reprisals against the English maritime system, and especially the paper blockade before mentioned, of May 16th 1806. That order had been issued during the ministry of Fox, on the occasion of the occupation of Hanover by Prussia. Negociations were then going on between England and France; the latter Power had not complained of it at the time, and, as we have seen, the blockade had been partly revoked in September. Great Britain retaliated by an Order in Council of November 11th 1807, which declared all the ports of France, and of countries in alliance with her, as well as all ports and places in Europe whence the British flag was excluded, as well as all ports and places in colonies belonging to her enemies, to be subject to the same restrictions as if they were actually blockaded. Vessels bound for such ports were to be visited by the English cruisers, at an appointed station in Great Britain, and were to be subject to a tax, to be regulated by the British Legislature. It was in consequence of this order that Napoleon published his MILAN DECREE, December 17th 1807; by which every vessel submitting to the English regulations was declared *denationalised*, and lawful prize. All vessels, of whatsoever nation, coming from, or going to, ports in England, or the English colonies, or countries occupied by English troops, were to be liable to capture. Napoleon, however, after some vain attempts to substitute indigenous products for those of the colonies, and, at the same time, with the view of raising a revenue, somewhat modified his system. By the Decree of Trianon, August 5th 1810, completed by that of September 12th, colonial productions, such as tea, sugar, cotton, coffee, &c., instead of being prohibited, were subjected to an *ad valorem* duty of fifty per cent. He also adopted the method of *licenses*, by which speculators were permitted to import a certain quantity of colonial goods, on condition of exporting their value in certain fixed sorts of French manufactures. These licenses he afterwards *sold*.

Such were the main features of the Continental System, which

[23] Garden, t. x. p. 315 sq.

we have here flung together, without regard to their chronological order, in order that we may not have to recur to the subject. The design of it, which was the ruin of England, of course totally failed. English commerce found outlets in other quarters of the globe, and also still to a considerable extent in Europe. For the system was, in reality, a blockade, not of England, but of the continental States, which suffered to a degree that threatened a return of the misery and barbarism of the dark ages. Russia, which had so readily accepted the plans of Napoleon, found the value of the rouble sink rapidly from 3 francs to 1.[24] We now return to the narrative.

The Peace of Tilsit was immediately followed by a rupture between England and Denmark. The Danes had hitherto succeeded in maintaining their neutrality; but now the tide of war had rolled up to their very frontiers, and it was evident that a neutral policy would not much longer be possible.[25] Compelled to choose between France and England, it was evident from her antecedent policy that Denmark would decide for France. Napoleon had three motives for desiring possession of Denmark: it would enable him to close her ports against the English, to attack Sweden by an invasion from Zealand, to seize the Danish fleet and employ it against England. There could not be a reasonable doubt that the policy pursued by the First Consul and the Emperor Paul I. in 1801, would be renewed—that Denmark and Sweden would be called upon to declare against England, and to shut the Sound against her. But the Cabinet of St. James's had good grounds for something more than mere suspicion. A French bulletin, published after the battle of Friedland, had announced that the continental blockade would very soon become effectual. When the Berlin Decree was communicated to the Danish Court, it was requested to withdraw its troops from Holstein, and to shut its ports against English and Swedish commerce. Besides these overt indications, the English Government had gotten possession of the secret Treaties of Tilsit, of which we have already recorded the designs against Denmark and the Danish fleet.[26] These designs

[24] See the Report of an eminent financier, ap. Garden, t. x. p. 321. It is a singular fact that, a few months after the Berlin Decree, an order having arrived at Hamburg for clothing for the French army which the Hanse Towns were not able to execute, Bourrienne, the French agent, was obliged to contract with English houses. Thus the French soldiers who fought the battle of Friedland were clothed in the manufactures of England!—Bourrienne's *Mémoires*, t. vii. p. 292 sqq.

[25] Talleyrand wrote to M. Didelot, the French minister at Copenhagen, Aug. 4th: "Le Danemarck ne pourrait rester passif et il faudra bien qu'il se décide pour ou contre l'Angleterre."—Ap. Lefèbvre, ch. xxv.

[26] The English Ministry is said to have obtained these treaties by bribing Talleyrand.—Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18en*

they resolved to anticipate. No time was to be lost. Holstein was already menaced by the French; the winter was approaching, when any expedition to the Baltic would become impossible. Fortunately an armament was in readiness which had been prepared for the assistance of the Swedes and Prussians, and which was instantly diverted to meet the emergency. Part of it, under Lord Cathcart, had already arrived at the Isle of Rügen; and an additional force of 25 sail of the line, 9 frigates, a number of smaller vessels of war, and 377 transports, having on board 27,000 troops, was despatched to Copenhagen, July 27th. These were to be joined by the force at Rügen, when Lord Cathcart was to take the command in chief. Under him served Sir Arthur Wellesley, afterwards Lord Wellington. The fleet was commanded by Admiral Gambier and Commodore Keats. At the same time Sir F. Jackson was despatched to Copenhagen to propose to the Danish Government that their fleet should be carried to England and kept there till the peace, when it was to be restored in the same condition in which it had been found. To the Crown Prince, who ruled during the incompetence of his father, Christian VII., were offered an intimate alliance with Great Britain, a guarantee of all the Danish possessions, and even an augmentation of territory; in a word, the fleet, the armies, and the treasure of Great Britain were placed at his disposal to protect him against present danger and shelter him from future injury. But the Crown Prince, whether from a secret inclination to France, of which he was suspected, or from natural indignation at a demand, which, notwithstanding its conciliatory and advantageous terms, was a breach of his sovereignty and independence, peremptorily refused to listen to these proposals. The British troops were in consequence landed; Copenhagen was twice summoned to surrender, and General Peymann, the commandant, having refused to comply, a bombardment by sea and land was commenced, September 2nd, with such terrible effect that on the 5th the town capitulated. It was stipulated that the Danish fleet and naval stores should be surrendered; in consequence of which condition eighteen ships of the line, fifteen frigates, six brigs, with a number of sloops and gun-boats, were carried to England; also upwards of 2000 guns and an immense quantity of naval stores, a considerable part of which is said to have belonged to the French Government.[27]

Jahrhds, B. vii. S. 275. They themselves announced in their Declaration of Dec. 18th 1807, in answer to that of Russia of Nov. 7th, that they were not ignorant of the nature of the engagements which Russia had been forced to subscribe during the conferences at Tilsit. *Ann. Reg.*

[27] Lord Galloway's speech in Parliament, Jan. 1808.

This was, no doubt, a high-handed act, which can be justified only by the necessity of it. The violation of the independence of a peaceful, but high-spirited, nation was calculated to produce a sympathy for it; and it is not surprising that the proceeding of the English Ministry should have been loudly denounced, not only on the Continent but also by many persons in England. Of the indignation of the latter much was doubtless genuine and unaffected, much also the offspring of party spirit. But whoever shall calmly weigh the exigencies of the moment, the position of England in that portentous struggle, the importance of the Danish fleet not only from its intrinsic force but also from its position at the entrance of the Baltic, the moral certainty that it would be seized and used against us, the fact that the French were already threatening the Danish frontier, the knowledge that Russia would be a voluntary, Sweden a forced enemy of England, and that the fleet of Portugal was also to be seized and employed like that of Denmark, will perhaps admit that the prompt and vigorous act of the British Government was both justified by the circumstances and of the greatest utility to the country. Of this nothing can be a stronger proof than the fury of Napoleon on learning that he had been anticipated. He had, in fact, been foiled at his own weapons.

The Danish Government having rejected all proposals of accommodation, England declared war against Denmark, November 4th 1807. The capitulation of Copenhagen was, however, faithfully observed, and the English troops evacuated that city and the Island of Zealand towards the end of October.

The war between Denmark and England lasted till the Peace of Kiel, January 14th 1814. The Danes immediately lost their colonies of St. Thomas and St. Croix; nor were they able to make reprisals, though they entered into an alliance with France by the Treaty of Fontainebleau, October 31st 1807. They published, however, some virulent edicts against England; by one of which, dated at Rendsborg, November 6th 1807, all correspondence with that country was to be punished with death.[28]

By the Treaty of Fontainebleau, 30,000 French, under Bernadotte, were to invade Sweden from Denmark.[29] The Peace of Tilsit had left Sweden still at war with France. Gustavus IV. entertained for Napoleon a hatred almost approaching to insanity. Even after the overthrow of Prussia, Gustavus was still dreaming about the restoration of the Bourbons![30] Napoleon, on his side, deplored the war with Sweden. He had offered neutrality for

[28] Garden, t. x. p. 341.
[29] Koch et Schöll. *Traités*, t. ix. p. 77.
[30] See his letter to the King of Prussia, June 2nd 1807, ap. Garden, t. x. p. 269.

Swedish Pomerania, and when on its rejection Marshal Mortier occupied that province, he was instructed to do the Swedes as little harm as possible. Early in February 1807 Mortier had laid siege to Stralsund, which was occupied by General Essen with 15,000 Swedes. Mortier having withdrawn the greater part of his troops from before Stralsund in order to press the siege of Colberg, Essen seized the occasion to make a sortie, defeated the French and drove them beyond the Peene (April 1st); upon which Mortier returned from Colberg and defeated the Swedes at Belling. But in conformity with Napoleon's instructions to spare the Swedes, he concluded with Essen the armistice of Schlatkow, April 18th 1807. Hostilities were not to recommence without ten days' notice on either side; and during the armistice no troops were to be landed at Stralsund, or in the Isle of Rügen, nor at any point of Swedish Pomerania. An additional article of April 29th extended the notice to thirty days, but the King of Sweden never ratified it. Gustavus IV. was at this time negociating with the King of Prussia respecting the means of a joint attack upon the French; and by the Convention of Bartenstein, April 20th 1807, it was agreed that a Prussian corps should join the Swedes in Rügen, for the purpose of driving the French from Pomerania. After ratifying this Convention at Malmö, Gustavus IV. suddenly embarked and arrived at Stralsund, May 12th, with a corps of French Royalists; and Blücher, in pursuance of the Convention of Bartenstein, also entered Stralsund with a Prussian corps.

The King of Sweden had been very dissatisfied with the conduct of England under Lord Grenville's administration. Large promises had been made yet nothing had been done, though the forces of the country, which might have been better employed nearer home, had been dissipated by distant and abortive expeditions to Buenos Ayres, Egypt, and other places. But towards the end of March 1807 Lord Grenville had been succeeded as First Lord of the Treasury by the Duke of Portland, with Canning for Foreign Secretary, Lord Castlereagh as Secretary-at-War, and Mr. Perceval as Chancellor of the Exchequer. The new Ministry adopted a more vigorous line of foreign policy. The expedition to Rügen, under Lord Cathcart, to which we have already alluded, was resolved on; and after some negociation a Convention with Sweden to that effect was signed at London, June 17th, by which, however, Great Britain reserved the power of employing her troops in Pomerania for other purposes. About the same time a new treaty of subsidies was also concluded with Sweden, on condition that her army should be increased; and another with Prussia,

June 27th.[31] These steps, as we have seen, were rendered abortive by the battle of Friedland and the Peace of Tilsit. Gustavus IV., in ignorance of those events, and inspired with a blind confidence by the presence of the British and Prussian troops, denounced the Armistice of Schlatkow, July 3rd, and declaring that he had not recognised the additional article of April 29th, fixed the 13th of July for the recommencement of hostilities.

Meanwhile the French army on the coasts of the Baltic and North Sea had been reinforced and placed under the command of Marshal Brune. Among the reinforcements were 15,000 Spaniards under the command of the Marquis de la Romana, despatched by Charles IV. as a pledge of his fidelity.[32] Only a few days after the rupture of the armistice, Gustavus was informed by the King of Prussia of the Peace of Tilsit: Blücher and his troops were in consequence withdrawn from the Swedish army, and Lord Cathcart and his division were, as before related, transferred to Zealand. Gustavus, now evacuated Stralsund in order to spare it a bombardment; that place was entered by Brune August 20th, and the Swedes were also compelled ultimately to abandon Rügen by a Convention of September 7th.[33]

Agreeably to the Peace of Tilsit, the Emperor of Russia offered to the British Cabinet his mediation for a peace with France; which was accepted, but on condition that the Emperor should communicate the secret articles of that peace and frankly explain his views. It was, in fact, impossible for the English Government to expect that a Power which had sold itself to France, and had sacrificed her Prussian ally, should perform impartially the duty of a mediator. The bombardment of Copenhagen had aggravated the resentment which Alexander felt towards England for the refusal of a loan. He declined to make the communication desired; and in a declaration of November 7th 1807 broke off all communication with Great Britain, reproached her with the grievances which he conceived he had suffered at her hands, declared null all former treaties with her, and proclaimed anew the principles of the Armed Neutrality. The English Ministry answered, with dignity and moderation, in a counter-declaration of December 18th. They intimated that they were not ignorant of the nature of the secret engagements to which Russia had been forced to subscribe at Tilsit, but had hoped that, by a reconsideration of them, the Emperor might have been induced to withdraw himself from those new counsels and connections which he had adopted in a moment

[31] All these treaties will be found in Garden, t. x. *Notes et Documents.*

[32] Lefèbvre, ch. xxiii. See below.

[33] Martens, t. xi. p. 467.

of alarm and dejection. They showed, indeed, their knowledge of the secret articles by reproaching the Emperor with abandoning to France the Ionian Republic, whose independence he had solemnly guaranteed. They declined to exculpate themselves respecting the Danish expedition; it was not for those who were parties to the secret arrangements of Tilsit to demand satisfaction for a measure which those arrangements had occasioned, and by which the object of them had been happily frustrated. They concluded with expressing their determination to maintain their principles of maritime law against any Confederation whatsoever; which were become of incalculable importance at an epoch when the maritime power of Great Britain was the sole existing defence against the unceasing usurpations of France, and the only refuge to which other nations might in happier times have recourse.[34]

Thus began the war between Great Britain and Russia, which lasted nearly five years. From the position of the two countries, it was productive of but few military events, though it occasioned great privation and distress in the Russian Empire, and was highly unpopular among its inhabitants. Austria was also drawn into the Continental System by the influence and example of the Emperor Alexander. Summoned after the Peace of Tilsit to enter into that league, she called upon Great Britain to enter into negociations with France for a peace; and on the refusal of the English Cabinet, principally on the ground that no bases of negociation were laid down, the Austrian minister took his departure from London in January 1808. The evacuation of Braunau by the French was the reward of this base subserviency. Thus England was deserted by her faithless allies; she, instead of France, became the object of a European Coalition. Her commerce was excluded from the ports of Russia, Prussia, Denmark, Germany, Holland, France, Italy, and Dalmatia. In the North, Sweden alone endeavoured to preserve herself from the Continental System; but her efforts involved her in a war to which we shall presently advert. The Turks showed more good sense and more fidelity to their engagements than most of the Christian Powers. Their ports remained open to all friendly nations, and the commerce between London and Hamburg was conducted through Constantinople! Yet the Porte had only recently emerged from a war with England, which we must here briefly relate.

The conquest of Egypt, so perfidiously undertaken by Bonaparte, had roused the indignation of the Turks; his expulsion had

[34] See these Declarations in Garden, t. x. pp. 348—363. *Ann. Register.*

excited their contempt. France had lost with the Turk the prestige both of friendship and of power. The Porte had, indeed, concluded a peace with Bonaparte as First Consul in June 1802; but it refused to acknowledge him as Emperor of the French and King of Italy. But the battle of Austerlitz, and the rupture between France and Russia, conveyed at once a strong idea of the military power of the French, and of the utility of their alliance to the Porte. Reciprocal embassies were sent early in 1806, and the Porte consented to give Napoleon the title of *Padishah*, or Emperor. In the summer of that year, General Sebastiani was despatched to Constantinople, with instructions to incite Sultan Selim III. against the English and Russians, and to place at his disposal all the resources of France. Sebastiani denounced the perfidy of Russia in keeping possession of the Ionian Islands; he insinuated that the French army in Dalmatia would act for or against the Turks according to circumstances; and in a note of September 16th 1806, he called upon the Porte to close the Bosphorus against all Russian and English ships of war and transports. At his instance the Sultan deposed the princes Moruzzi and Ypsilanti, the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia, who were attached to Russian interests, and appointed in their places Suzzo and Callimachi, the devoted partisans of France. The Porte was moved to this anti-Russian policy by some causes of complaint which she had against that nation. Questions of maritime right had arisen between the two countries; and the Porte also accused Russia of supporting an insurrection in Servia, which, conducted by George Petrowitsch, had assumed a very formidable character.

The dismissal of the Hospodars was contrary to a convention between Russia and the Porte of September 24th 1802, by which it had been agreed that those princes should be appointed for seven years; and in case they should commit any offence, their conduct was to be submitted, before dismissal, to the Russian Court. Here, then, was a clear breach of treaty which might justify a war; and as Russia had long cast a covetous eye on the Danubian provinces, and, moreover, foresaw that through French artifices a war with Turkey would become inevitable, she resolved to anticipate it. The Porte was summoned to observe her stipulations with respect to Moldavia and Wallachia; to restore order in the latter province, which had been disturbed; to permit the passage of the Dardanelles by Russian ships of war, and to renew its alliance with England. But previously to the delivery of this note, and although the Hospodars had been restored, the Russian

general, Michelson, had entered Moldavia, surprised Choczin, occupied Jassy, blockaded Bender, and advanced towards the Danube. On December 23rd 1806 a battle took place at Groda, in which the Turks were defeated, and on the 27th Michelson entered Bucharest in Wallachia. On the 31st, the Porte formally declared war against Russia, and, a few days after, notified to foreign Powers that the Bosphorus was closed.

After the Turkish declaration of war, Russia demanded the aid of England. This was an embarrassing demand. But the Whig Ministry accepted it, nay, though Turkey was an ancient ally, determined to attempt the seizure of part of her dominions. On January 25th 1807, Sir C. Arbuthnot, the English ambassador at Constantinople, accused the Porte of partiality for France, demanded the expulsion of the French ambassador, threatened an expedition against Constantinople. The Reis Effendi having denied these accusations and refused the satisfaction demanded, Sir C. Arbuthnot, accompanied by all the English merchants, went on board the Endymion frigate, and joined the English squadron off Tenedos. Admiral Sir John Duckworth was summoned with his squadron from Cadiz; and on February 19th he forced the passage of the Dardanelles with nine ships of the line, three frigates, and several fire ships, and seized and burnt a Turkish squadron at Gallipoli. His appearance before Constantinople filled that city with consternation. He demanded the immediate dismissal of the French ambassador; the renewal of the alliance with England and Russia; free passage of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles for Russian ships of war; the surrender of the Turkish navy, to be kept in an English port till the peace. But he suffered himself to be amused with negociations, whilst the Turks, directed by Sebastiani and other French officers, put Constantinople into so formidable a posture of defence that he found it prudent to accelerate his retreat; which was effected, not without some loss, March 3rd. After this failure, Duckworth proceeded to Malta and embarked 5000 troops for a *coup de main* upon Egypt; a force wholly inadequate for such a purpose. Alexandria, indeed, was taken, but two attempts on Rosetta failed (March 30th, April 19th). The English held Alexandria till September 22nd, when they were attacked by Mahommed Ali Pasha, and forced to capitulate. This was another instance in which the force of England was frittered away, which might have been better employed in another quarter.

Meanwhile a revolution had occurred at Constantinople. Sultan Selim III., an excellent prince, had become unpopular by introducing some reforms, and especially by attempting to substitute

regular troops, after the European fashion, in place of the Janissaries. These latter, incited by the Uhlemas and led by the Mufti in person, rose in insurrection, deposed Selim, May 30th 1807, and placed upon the throne his nephew, Mustapha IV., son of the Sultan Abdul Hamed, who, at the time of his father's death, was too young to ascend the throne.

The Russians had carried on the war without much vigour. The only important action on shore was the defeat of Yussuf Pasha by General Groudowitsch on the river Aspatschai, June 18th. At sea, the Turkish fleet under Saïd Ali was completely defeated off Lemnos by the Russian admiral Siniavin, July 1st. By the Peace of Tilsit, Russia agreed to evacuate Moldavia and Wallachia, and an armistice was concluded at Slobosia, August 24th 1807.[35] The English ambassador, Sir Arthur Paget, had acquainted the Porte with the secret articles of Tilsit, and the abandonment of their interests by Napoleon, who had induced them to take up arms, but whom they now beheld the intimate ally of their ancient and most dangerous enemy. These occurrences tended to reconcile the Porte with England. In spite of the hostilities which had occurred, there had been no declaration of war between the two countries; and at length a treaty was effected, January 5th 1809.[36] The treaty between Charles II. and Mahomet IV. in 1675, which was very favourable to England, was taken as the basis of it. The navigation of the Black Sea, accorded to the English in 1799, was also confirmed, but no ships of war were to pass the Dardanelles. The armistice between Russia and Turkey was prolonged till 1809, when a fresh war broke out between those Powers.

The war between Russia and Sweden, to which we have alluded, was an immediate result of the Peace of Tilsit, and we shall, therefore, briefly relate it here. The adherence of Gustavus IV. to a cause which the Emperor Alexander had repudiated produced a breach between them. Hostilities were brought on by the Emperor in a most artful and insidious manner. His long silence, his feigned irresolution, his affected scruples, the pacific and friendly language of his ministers, were all calculated to deceive the unhappy Gustavus, and lull him in a false security. Such was the odious duplicity of one of the most powerful monarchs of the world to one of the weakest, his ally and brother-in-law, whom he could reproach with no other wrong than his refusal to violate the oaths which, but a little before, had united them both to England.[37] After the bombardment of Copenhagen, Alexander summoned the King of

[35] Martens, t. viii. p. 689.
[36] Martens, *Nouv. Rec.*, t. i. p. 160.
[37] Lefèbvre, ch. xxix.

Sweden, whose sister he had married, to revert, like himself, to the principles of the Armed Neutrality. Gustavus replied, November 13th 1807, that the neutrality of the Baltic was out of the question, so long as the French had a preponderance upon its coasts, and called upon the Emperor to engage the French to withdraw their troops from those quarters. As the Emperor persisted in his demand, Gustavus applied to England for aid, and on February 8th 1808, a treaty of subsidies was concluded at Stockholm,[38] by which the English Government agreed to pay the Swedes 100,000*l.* sterling a month, for twelve months, to commence from the previous January; Gustavus, on his side, undertaking to keep up a respectable force, and especially at sea. The Emperor of Russia delivered a last declaration, or manifest, to the Court of Stockholm, February 22nd 1808; but before any reply could be made, a Russian army, under Buxhövden, passed the Kymené, and entered Finland. At the news of this invasion, which had not been preceded by any declaration of war, Gustavus, against the law of nations, caused M. Alopeus, the Russian ambassador at Stockholm, to be arrested, March 3rd. When the Emperor Alexander received intelligence of this act he declared to the foreign ministers at his court that he should not make reprisals for this breach of international law: but he notified that henceforth he should regard Swedish Finland as annexed to his Empire: certainly a very handsome indemnification for the arrest of his ambassador! On the other hand, the King of Sweden sought to compensate himself for the injury inflicted upon him by Russia by invading Norway, belonging to Denmark, and diverted for that purpose 20,000 men, who might have sufficed to hold the Russians in check. The Danes, agreeably to the treaty with France already mentioned,[39] had undertaken to conquer the Swedish province of Schonen. The Emperor had detached from the grand army for that purpose 14,000 Spaniards under La Romana; these were united in Fünen with 15,000 Danes, the whole under the command of Bernadotte, Prince of Ponte Corvo. The Danes declared war against Sweden February 29th 1808.

The campaign in Norway, without any marked success on either side, turned on the whole to the advantage of the Danes; the Swedes were driven out, and the Danes in their turn invaded Sweden. In Schonen, Gustavus, instead of keeping on the defensive, meditated an expedition against Copenhagen, and he had, therefore, assembled a considerable body of troops in that province.

[38] Martens, *Nouv. Rec.*, t. i. p. 2.

[39] *Supra*, p. 440.

He was assisted by an English army of 12,000 men, under Sir John Moore, as well as an English fleet under Admiral Saumarez (May 1808). The English Government, however, aware of the eccentric character of the King of Sweden, had placed some restrictions on the employment of these forces. The troops were principally intended for the defence of Gothenburg, and they were by no means to undertake an expedition into Zealand; but as Gustavus did not relish these restrictions, the troops were not permitted to land. Gustavus proposed to Sir John Moore first an expedition to Russian Finland, and then to Norway, neither of which was deemed feasible by the English general; and as the disembarkation of the troops continued to be forbidden, Sir John Moore, after notice to that effect, returned to England with the fleet, July 3rd. The presence of the English, however, as well as the Swedish troops in Schonen, had compelled Bernadotte to abandon his project of an invasion, and had filled Copenhagen with the terror of another bombardment. Bernadotte's army, too, was weakened by the desertion of La Fontana, who contrived to evade in August with 8000 of his men.

The war in Finland produced more decisive results. The Russian general, Buxhövden, entered Abo, the capital of the grand-duchy, March 23rd 1807, and burnt the fleet there. The important place of Sveaborg surrendered on the 6th, with ninety-four vessels. The Russian admiral, Bodiskoff, captured Gothland and the Aland Isles. But these reverses were in part retrieved. The Swedish general, Klingspor, seconded by the patriotic devotion of the Finns, marching from Oléaborg about the middle of May with 17,000 men, drove the Russians from East Bothnia. The Swedes, assisted by the English fleet, compelled the Russians to evacuate Gothland and the Aland Isles. Admiral Saumarez defeated the Russian fleet, and kept it blockaded several months in Baltischport, till the approach of winter forced him to leave the Baltic. But these successes were not lasting. The Russians, under Kamenskoi, having received considerable reinforcements, again drove back the Swedes, and successively took possession of Lappfiord, Christianstadt, Wasa, and the two Carlebys. Gamla (old) Carleby was entered September 24th. The Swedes were also repulsed in some descents in South Finland. Klingspor obtained from General Buxhövden a suspension of arms, September 29th; but the Emperor Alexander refused to recognise it, and proclaimed the union of Finland with Russia. A fresh armistice, more favourable to the Russians, was signed at Olkioki, November 19th 1808,[40] by which

[40] Martens, *Nouv. Rec.*, t. i. p. 15.

the Swedes agreed to evacuate the whole province of Uleaborg, and the Russians were allowed to occupy both banks of the Kimi, at the head of the Gulf of Bothnia.

Gustavus IV. concluded with Great Britain a treaty of subsidies, March 1st 1809,[41] by which he was to receive 1,200,000*l.* But this was the last political act of his life. The expensive and disastrous campaign of 1808 had excited great discontent, especially among the soldiery; and as Gustavus had added to it by attributing the recent misfortunes to his guards, the officers of that regiment, and some generals and nobles, entered into a conspiracy to dethrone him, and marched upon Stockholm. Field-Marshal Klingspor, General Adlercreuz, and other officers, arrested Gustavus in his apartments on the night of March 12th 1809. His uncle, Duke Charles of Sudermania, who had played a very equivocal part when Gustavus III. was assassinated, appeared amidst the tumult, but interposed not his authority in favour of his nephew. On the 14th Duke Charles undertook the regency; the King was conducted to Drottingholm, and on the 29th he signed his abdication. Not a hand was raised in his favour; so far from it, the States thanked the Duke for undertaking the Regency, as well as the conspirators for an act which had saved the country from ruin. Gustavus, who was hardly in his right mind, was ultimately permitted to quit the kingdom. A committee was appointed to make some alterations in the constitution; the chief feature of which was the establishment of a Council of State, consisting of nine members, responsible to the nation, who were to decide upon important matters. The executive power was left to the King. The Regent accepted the crown on these conditions, and was proclaimed as Charles XIII., June 5th.

Hostilities had continued in 1809 with balanced success, but negociations were opened by the new King, and a treaty of peace was signed at Friederichsamn Sept. 17th.[42] Charles XIII. promised to adhere to the Continental System, but made an exception in favour of salt and colonial productions. Finland with the Aland Isles, and part of West Bothnia, were ceded to Russia. Napoleon, however, would not recognise the exceptions stipulated in the treaty, though absolutely necessary to the comfort and welfare of the Swedish people; and in order to make peace with France, Charles was obliged to abandon them. The war declared against Napoleon by Gustavus IV., Oct. 31st 1805, was terminated

[41] Martens, *Nouv. Rec.*, t. i. p. 8.
[42] Koch et Schöll, *Hist. des Traités*, t. xiv. p. 208 sq.; Martens, *Ibid.*, p. 19.

by the Treaty of Paris, January 6th 1810.[43] Napoleon restored Swedish Pomerania and the principality of Rügen. Peace between Sweden and Denmark was signed at Jönköping December 10th 1809.[44] The treaty contains no article of importance.

It has been seen that by the secret arrangements at Tilsit, Portugal also was to be compelled into the Continental System. Napoleon after that peace had returned to Paris, July 29th 1807, and was saluted with the servile flattery of all the public bodies. The base adulation of the legislature can only be compared with that of the Roman Senate under Tiberius. Napoleon experienced no difficulty in riveting their chains. The tribunate was entirely suppressed, August 19th, and at the same time the legislative body was modified. Nobody under forty years of age was henceforth to be a member of that assembly. These arbitrary measures were lauded even by those who were the objects of them. But the Emperor's views were chiefly directed to the execution of his continental plans. By an imperial decree of August 18th, Hesse-Cassel, Brunswick, Fulda, the greater part of Hanover, and other districts, were united into the Kingdom of Westphalia, which, till Jerôme should assume the crown, was placed under the administration of a regency. Napoleon next turned his views towards Portugal. But in order to reach that country he determined to use the arm of Spain; and we must therefore describe the relations existing between him and the Court of Madrid.

Since the erection of the Kingdom of Etruria in 1801, in favour of the son-in-law of Charles IV., an apparent harmony had existed between that monarch and France. But the compulsory alliance was entirely in favour of the French. Napoleon, measuring his demands only by the contempt which he felt for Spain, treated her rather as a vassal than an ally. Thus she had been compelled to abandon her claim upon Louisiana, to pay a tribute of 72 million francs, to lend her navy for the purposes of France, to see it almost annihilated by the English at Trafalgar: all this without any prospect of advantage, but on the contrary, with the certainty of having her colonies ravished from her and her commerce destroyed. The royal family, besides these grievances common to the whole nation, had others peculiar to themselves. Charles IV. had seen his brother Ferdinand hurled from the throne of Naples, and had been compelled to recognise Joseph Bonaparte as his successor. The hostility manifested by Napoleon towards all the Bourbons, the murder of the Duke d'Enghien, afforded little hope that the

[43] Martens, *Nouv. Rec.*, t. xii. p. 232. [44] *Ibid.* p. 223.

Spanish branch of that house would escape overthrow when the occasion should present itself. It was also known to the Court of Madrid that Napoleon had contemplated bestowing portions of the Spanish territory on others. Thus in the negociations for a peace with England he had offered to cede the Spanish colony of Puerto Rico. He had also proposed to give the Balearic Islands to the Neapolitan Bourbons, as an indemnity for Sicily, to be ceded to his brother Joseph; and to burthen Spain with a large annuity payable to the same family.[45] These considerations awakened in the Court of Madrid a desire to throw off the French yoke; and a resolution to that effect appears to have been taken about June 1806. Secret negociations were opened with England and Russia, and Portugal also appears to have been in the plot.[46] The Spanish Government promised to declare against France, as soon as she should be engaged with the Northern Powers. The Prince of the Peace, sometimes under pretence of a war with Portugal, sometimes of an attack upon Gibraltar, began to raise troops, and on the 5th October appeared a proclamation calling the whole nation to arms. Nine days later Prussia was overthrown at Jena and Auerstädt! The news of that event overwhelmed the Court of Madrid with consternation. The Prince of the Peace sought to excuse himself with the French ambassador by falsehood, flattery, and humiliation. The sudden suspension of the armaments was explained by various pretexts; the state of the finances, the lack of public spirit, the reluctance of the King to attack Portugal. The bad faith of these excuses was transparent; but Napoleon, who had learned the whole truth from the intercepted despatches of the Prussian minister at Madrid, had a formidable war on hand with the Russians, and for the present he dissembled his resentment. He demanded, however, a force of infantry, cavalry, and artillery to join the army of observation in Hanover. "Spain had just raised troops, now was the time to employ them."[47] He also required that a Spanish squadron of six ships of the line at Carthagena should proceed to Toulon. He sent into Spain 25,000 Prussians captured at Jena. Finally, he communicated to the Spanish Government the Berlin Decree, and desired that it should be put into immediate execution in all the ports of Spain. It was in consequence of these demands that the Spanish force under the Marquis de la Romana, already mentioned, proceeded to the north of Europe.

Napoleon had learned that he could no longer trust the Spa-

[45] See Sir A. Alison, *Hist. of Europe*, ch. lii.

[46] Lefèbvre, ch. xxviii. t. iii. p. 289.

[47] *Ibid.* p. 303.

niards, and he secretly resolved to overthrow the Bourbon dynasty in Spain, to render that country another satellite of France. This plan, as we have seen, was arranged with the Emperor Alexander at Tilsit. But such an enterprise was not to be lightly undertaken. An open attack might awaken the patriotism of a brave and loyal nation; and Napoleon, therefore, determined to use perfidy. He resolved, first to make Spain a cat's-paw for the destruction of Portugal, and then to overwhelm her by the very means which had been prepared for that purpose. A French army, intended both to conquer Portugal and to overawe Spain, had been assembled in the environs of Bayonne early in 1807. The Prince of the Peace was gained by splendid promises, and in July the Court of Madrid was called upon to join France in summoning the Portuguese Government to shut their ports against the English. In case of refusal, France and Spain were to declare war against Portugal, and a combined French and Spanish army was to march upon Lisbon. The Regent of Portugal had married a daughter of the Spanish sovereigns; but they had no alternative but to submit. On the 12th of August, the Spanish and French ambassadors at Lisbon jointly signified to the Regent that if by September 1st 1807 he had not declared war against England, dismissed the English ambassador, and recalled his own from London, arrested as hostages all the English in Portugal, confiscated all property belonging to that nation, and united his squadrons with those of France and Spain, he would find himself at war with those countries. At the same time the French and Spanish forces began to move towards the frontiers of Portugal.[48]

The Regent Don John, naturally irresolute and mistrustful, had recently betrayed symptoms of the same mental alienation which had so long afflicted his mother; and the Ministers had even deliberated whether they should not transfer the regency to the hands of his wife. Such was the man on whom reposed the destinies of Portugal and of the House of Braganza at a conjuncture which not even the firmest courage, the most brilliant intellect, might be able to meet. The first impulse of the Regent was to fly to the Brazils. But it is a hard thing to quit one's country and a throne. He endeavoured to appease the French Emperor by some submissions. He promised to declare war against England, to shut his ports against her, to put his fleet at the disposal of France. Such concessions, one would imagine, ought to have satisfied Napoleon, had he not had ulterior designs. But he had

[48] Lefèbvre, ch. xxviii. t. iii. p. 308.

resolved on the ruin both of Portugal and Spain. He insisted on the fulfilment of all the proposed conditions, including the arrest of the English, and the confiscation of their properties. The moral and religious sentiments of the Regent revolted at so unjust and tyrannical a requisition, and he positively refused to comply with it. The French ambassador, M. de Rayneval, now demanded his passports, and Don John, by the advice of his Ministers, prepared to quit Portugal. The English established in that country had been secretly informed of the danger which menaced them, and more than three hundred families embarked, carrying with them a large proportion of the circulating medium of the country. At the same time five ships of the line and other vessels were rapidly equipped to convey the royal family to Brazil, and the aid of England was invoked in the undertaking.

The resolution was neither unnecessary nor premature. Two secret Conventions between France and Spain were signed at Fontainebleau, October 27th 1808, for the division and occupation of Portugal.[49] The kingdom was to be divided into three portions. The province of Entre Douro and Minho, with the title of North Lusitania, was destined for the young King of Etruria, who was to cede his Italian kingdom to France. The Algarves and the province of Alentejo were to be given to the Prince of the Peace, with the title of Prince of the Algarves. These two states were to be under the protectorate of the King of Spain; and if issue of their sovereigns, both male and female, should become extinct, then the right of investiture devolved to his Catholic Majesty; but on condition that these principalities should not be united with the crown of Spain nor with each other. The rest of Portugal, comprising the provinces of Beira, Tras-os-Montes, and Estramadura, were to be sequestered in the hands of France till the general peace; when they were to be restored to the House of Braganza, on condition that England should agree to return to the King of Spain Gibraltar, Trinidad, and the other Spanish possessions which she had conquered during the war. The Portuguese colonies were to be divided between France and Spain. Napoleon guaranteed Charles IV. his European possessions, and the title of "Emperor of the Two Americas," to be assumed at the general peace, or, at latest, within three years. Such were the baits with which Charles was to be lured on to his ruin.

[49] They will be found in Cantillo, *Tratados de Paz y de Comercio*, p. 710, and in Cevallos, *Exposé des moyens qui ont été mis en usage par l'Empereur Napoléon pour usurper la couronne d'Espagne*, App. (translated by Nettement). See also Lefèbvre, t. iii. p. 321 sq.; Garden, t. x. p. 372 sq.

Napoleon did not await the signature of the treaties to act against Portugal. General Junot, with the army of invasion, crossed the Bidassoa, October 18th, and advanced with rapid marches on Salamanca. At the same time three Spanish divisions were put in motion, two of which were to take possession of the provinces assigned to the King of Etruria and the Prince of the Peace; while the third was to join the French at Alcantara, and in conjunction with them to march upon Lisbon. A second French army of 40,000 men, assembled at Bayonne, was to enter Portugal in case the English should threaten an attack. By a treaty of October 22nd, England had secretly authorised the Portuguese Regent ostensibly to separate his cause from hers, and to shut against her his ports and markets; but only on condition that France and Spain should declare themselves satisfied. The Regent accordingly declared war against England, recalled his ambassador from London, sequestered all English property still remaining in Portugal; and, in virtue of this apparent submission, demanded that the advance of the French troops should be arrested. But Napoleon, persuaded that the Regent was deceiving him, directed Junot to precipitate his march.

Don John, irresolute to the last, had vainly attempted to appease Napoleon by proposing a marriage between the Prince of Beira, his son, and the daughter of the Grand Duke of Berg, and by offering a considerable subsidy. Sir Sidney Smith, with an English fleet, arrived at the mouth of the Tagus, and declared that river blockaded, November 22nd. Sir John Moore, who was proceeding from Sicily to the Baltic with a corps of 10,000 men, destined to aid the King of Sweden, was also ordered to wait at Lisbon, and in case of need to support Sir Sidney Smith. These forces were intended to facilitate the escape of the Portuguese royal family, if it was really their intention to fly; or, if they were playing false, to treat Portugal as an enemy. Another reason for their appearance was the presence of the Russian admiral, Siniavin, who had put into the Tagus with a fleet of nine ships of the line, two frigates, and more than 6000 troops, on his return from the Mediterranean to the Baltic. A notice from Junot that he had arrived at Abrantès, within four days' march of Lisbon, at length put an end to the irresolution of the Regent. On the same day that he received this news, Sir S. Smith forwarded to the unfortunate Prince the *Moniteur* of November 13th, in which appeared the following notice: "The Prince Regent of Portugal is deprived of his throne. The fall of the House of Braganza will be a fresh proof that the ruin of those who attach themselves to the English is inevitable."

All doubt was now removed. Liberty and a throne in Brazil were preferable to a compulsory abdication, and perhaps imprisonment in France. The royal family embarked November 27th, amid the regret and lamentations of the people. For the first time since sixteen years the afflicted Queen Maria I. quitted her palace of Mafra to abandon her native land. Most of the great families and rich merchants of the kingdom accompanied their sovereigns in their exile, to the number, it is said, of more than 15,000 persons. The royal fleet, escorted by some English ships of the line, arrived at Rio de Janeiro, January 18th 1808.

Junot entered Lisbon, November 30th 1807, with only about 1500 men, a great part of his army having been left far in the rear, through the difficulties of the march. The people were filled with contempt on beholding this small force, composed, for the most part, of beardless conscripts; and an attempt was made at insurrection, December 13th, but was put down by the promptitude and decision of Junot. That general was appointed by Napoleon governor-general of the kingdom, which he ruled in the most tyrannical and oppressive manner. The Spanish armies had invaded with equal success the provinces assigned to the King of Etruria and the Prince of the Peace, but were not suffered to retain them. Maria Louisa, Queen Dowager of Etruria, who acted as Regent for her minor son, Charles Louis, resigned the government in December 1807, and set off for Spain; when Tuscany was immediately occupied by the French.

By the conquest of Portugal was completed the establishment of the Continental System in Southern Europe, to which Pope Pius VII. had already acceded for the States of the Church. But that Pontiff was to experience some further consequences of the Peace of Tilsit.

Pius VII. had several reasons to be dissatisfied with Napoleon's conduct. Although, contrary to the advice of many of his cardinals, he had proceeded to Paris to crown the Emperor, he had received no benefit from that act of condescension. So far from procuring the restoration of the Legations, a plan had even been formed by some of the French ministers while Pius was in France to secularise the territories which he still held in Italy, to annex them to the Italian Kingdom, and to detain him in France, where he was to exercise his papal functions.[50] Napoleon did not indeed sanction this project, but he treated the Holy Father with marked disrespect. Although the period had been fixed for his return to Rome, the

[50] Lefèbvre, ch. xxvii.

means of conveyance were withheld, and he was kept some time in France, to the great alarm of his court and subjects. Napoleon subsequently made some important ecclesiastical reforms in Lombardy, without even deigning to ask the opinion, much less the approval, of the Court of Rome. Pius, on his side, seized every occasion to display his resentment. He refused Napoleon's application to him to dissolve the marriage contracted by Jerôme Bonaparte in America with Miss Patterson, a Protestant. In the war of 1805 Pius had showed himself a decided partisan of the Coalition; had opposed Cardinal Fesch's demand that the Pontifical Government should establish a military cordon on its Neapolitan frontier to prevent the irruption of the allies; nay, had even declared that if the Russians made an attempt on Cività Vecchia he should not oppose them. Napoleon, as usual, deferred his anger, till he had triumphed over his enemies. After the Peace of Presburg he gave it vent. He addressed an angry letter to the Pope from Munich, January 7th 1806. On February 13th he wrote to him from Paris in still harsher terms, and instructed Cardinal Fesch to demand the immediate expulsion of all Russians, English, Swedes, and Sardinians from the Pontifical States, and the shutting of all the papal ports against the enemies of France. Pius at first declined to comply with these demands. Sensible, however, of the danger to which he exposed himself, he privately engaged the English, Russian, and Sardinian ministers to leave Rome. He also hinted that he should not object to see a French garrison in Cività Vecchia, and General Duhesme in consequence took military occupation of that place. But Napoleon was not to be so conciliated. His violence and hauteur towards the pontiff were redoubled. Pius gave fresh offence, when Joseph Bonaparte was made King of Naples, by reviving the papal claim of investiture with regard to that crown, and from this time Napoleon appears to have determined upon the eventual seizure of the Pope's temporal dominions. He immediately adopted some arbitrary and violent measures. He proceeded to fill up some Venetian bishoprics without asking the sanction of the Pope. He demanded the expulsion from Rome of certain leaders of bands who had formerly fought against France. Nay, as the Papal Government, in an edict for raising some new taxes, had imputed the necessity for them to the passage and presence of French troops, thus pointing them out to the hatred of the Romans, Napoleon demanded an account of the revenue and expenses of the Roman State for the last two years; thus treating it like a dependent province. He also seized the principalities of Benevento and Ponte Corvo, which, though situate in the King-

dom of Naples, belonged to the Holy See, and presented the first to Talleyrand, the second to Bernadotte.

To all these blows Pius VII. opposed the most unbending resistance. He had conceived that the persecution of the Church would infallibly reanimate the fervour of religious faith now almost universally extinct, and he gradually resigned himself to the idea of deprivation, flight, even death itself, in that holy cause. After the battle of Friedland, M. Alquier, the French ambassador at Rome, attempted to persuade the Pontiff to reconcile himself with Napoleon before it was too late, by recognising the King of Naples, joining the offensive and defensive league of the Italian States, and adopting the Continental System. But Napoleon had now determined on annexing all Italy to his Empire, as he had stipulated with Alexander at Tilsit. He was willing, indeed, at first, to leave Rome and its territory to the Pope; who, however, was to be deprived of the Duchy of Urbino, the March of Ancona, and Macerata, the richest provinces of the Holy See, and the chief sources of the papal revenue. An order for the occupation of these provinces was issued September 29th.

The advance of the French troops had been already announced, when a treaty, concluded at Paris by Cardinal Bayanne, the Papal plenipotentiary, in which all Napoleon's demands had been conceded, arrived at Rome. Pius rejected it with the deepest indignation, as an attack upon the independence, dignity, and spiritual rights of the Head of the Church; and in these views he was supported by the Consistory. He wrote with his own hand to Cardinal Bayanne, to disavow all that he had done, and to cancel the powers with which he had been intrusted. Nothing could be more agreeable to Napoleon's views than this rupture of the negociations. General Miollis being immediately instructed to occupy Rome, appeared at the head of his troops, before the Porta del Popolo, on the morning of February 2nd 1808, marched unopposed to the Castle of St. Angelo, and received on the first summons the keys of that fortress. Resistance would, indeed, have been useless. The Pope contented himself with placarding on the walls of Rome a protest against the entry of the French, in which he proclaimed his inability to prevent it, and exhorted his subjects to imitate his resignation. All the Italian cardinals and bishops, the Pope's chief advisers, were compelled to leave Rome, and General Miollis was directed to assume the government of the States of the Church. The Pontiff retorted with such arms as he had at his disposal. Pius ventured in the nineteenth century to launch against Napoleon the feeble thunders of a comminatory

brief of excommunication, in retribution of the aggressions which he had committed upon the temporalities of the Holy See (March 27th 1808). The French Emperor replied by a decree of April 2nd, annexing, by virtue of his right as successor of Charlemagne, the provinces of Urbino, Ancona, Macerata, and Camerino to the Kingdom of Italy.[51] But this was not to be the whole extent of the Pontiff's misfortunes. Fate, or Providence, had still other trials in store for him, which will be related in the sequel.

[51] Garden, t. x. p. 382 sq.

CHAPTER XIV.

AT this period all the thrones of Europe had been more or less shaken by Napoleon, except that of England, which he could not reach, and that of Spain which had purchased exemption from the common lot by an oppressive and humiliating alliance. The latter also was now to feel the shock, but after a different manner. The conquests of Napoleon, whatever may be thought of their lawfulness, had hitherto, with the exception perhaps of Venice, at least been achieved in the open field by military skill and force of arms. He was now to show himself a no less consummate master in all the arts of fraud and intrigue.

The detested reign of Don Emanuel Godoy at length raised up against him at Madrid a party determined to rescue the Spanish nation from the disgrace of being governed by him. At the head of it were the Duke de l'Infantado, of one of the most illustrious families of Castile, and the canon Don Juan Escoiquiz, who had conducted the education of Ferdinand Prince of the Asturias, and heir to the crown.[1]

Ferdinand, who was now twenty-three years of age, had espoused, in 1803, a daughter of Queen Caroline of Naples. This princess, whose violent and intriguing character resembled that of her mother, soon rendered the Queen of Spain her enemy; Ferdinand naturally espoused the quarrels of his wife, and Escoiquiz, the confidant of the young prince, became irrevocably engaged in his cause. Thus the royal family was torn by faction, which continued after the premature death of the young princess who had occasioned it. A little knot of distinguished persons attached themselves to the heir to the crown, and the Court became divided into two parties, that of the Prince of the Asturias, and the Prince of the Peace. Godoy, having failed in an attempt to conciliate Ferdinand and to bring about the prince's marriage with the sister of

[1] For Spanish affairs at this period, see Escoiquiz, *Exposé des motifs qui ont engagé en* 1808, *S. M. C. Ferdinand VII. à se rendre à Bayonne*; Cevallos, *Exposé des moyens qui ont été employés par l'Emp. Napoléon pour usurper la couronne d'Espagne*; Lefèbvre, *Hist. des cabinets de l'Europe*, ch. xxx., xxxi.; De Pradt, *Mém. Hist. sur la Révol. d'Espagne*; Toreno, *Hist. del Levantamiento, Guerra y Revolucion de Espana.*

his wife, saw no hope of safety except in Ferdinand's ruin. Queen Louisa entered warmly into his plans against her own son; and as the feeble health of Charles IV. foreboded a speedy termination of his life, she conceived the abominable project of procuring from him a declaration that his eldest son was unfit to reign, and of thus prolonging her authority, with the title of Regent, in concert with Godoy. With this view, Ferdinand was painted in the blackest colours, was kept aloof from all affairs of state, and surrounded with spies; whilst the favourite, on the other hand, was raised to some of the highest and most important dignities of the kingdom, honoured with the title of "Royal Highness," and all the prerogatives of the Infants of Spain.

As the situation of Ferdinand seemed to grow still more dangerous and painful after the Peace of Tilsit and the apparently intimate union which ensued between the Courts of Madrid and the Tuileries, Ferdinand was advised by his confidants to supplant Godoy in the favour of the French Emperor, and to seek his protection by offering to marry a princess of the Imperial family. In these plans the Prince of the Asturias found a friend and guide in M. de Beauharnais, recently appointed French ambassador at Madrid. M. de Beauharnais cast his eyes upon Madlle. Tascher de la Pagerie, a niece of Josephine's, a young lady of great beauty and accomplishments, and Ferdinand privately wrote to Napoleon October 11th 1807, imploring his protection, and soliciting the hand of a princess of his family. The French Emperor did not commit himself by answering Ferdinand's letter; nevertheless from this period a family alliance with the Prince of the Asturias formed part of his political combinations. He did not, however, select Madlle. Tascher for that purpose. He had now begun to contemplate a divorce from Josephine, and he turned his views to the family of his brother Lucien. In an interview which he had with Lucien towards the end of 1807 at Mantua, he offered his brother the throne of Portugal, and the hand of the Prince of the Asturias for his daughter Charlotte, but on condition that Lucien should divorce his wife, Madame de Jauberton. But with Lucien affection proved stronger than ambition. He refused to separate from his wife; but consented that his daughter should proceed to Paris, to await the splendid destinies that seemed in store for her.

Meanwhile at Madrid, Godoy having caused Ferdinand to be arrested, October 29th, on the charge of conspiracy, the young prince was subjected to a severe and searching examination, at the end of which he was confined to his own apartments, and sentinels were posted at his door. Papers were found in his handwriting

in which the crimes and vices of the favourite were denounced in the most exaggerated terms; also a copy of the letter which he had written to Napoleon, a plan for what was to be done on the death of Charles IV., and various decrees which already bore the signature of Ferdinand VII., appointing different nobles of his party to various important posts. This discovery threw the Queen into transports of ungovernable fury. Aided by Godoy, she extorted from the King a proclamation, in which he denounced the conspiracy of his son and his perfidious advisers. She also persuaded him to write a letter to the French Emperor charging Ferdinand with a plot to dethrone himself, and put the Queen to death, and promising that the succession to the Spanish crown should be diverted to a younger and more worthy son.

Ferdinand, however, totally lacked the courage necessary to a conspirator. No sooner was he arrested than he informed his mother that he had important revelations to make. Caballero, the minister of justice, was sent to receive his depositions; when in the basest and most cowardly manner he gave up the names of all his advisers, without the slightest stipulation for their safety. Godoy, however, deemed it prudent to adopt the policy of clemency. The minute of the prince's letter to Napoleon, which seemed to have been written with the knowledge of the French ambassador, was a powerful motive to this course. It was evident that the Emperor was concerned in the matter, and with him a collision was not to be lightly ventured. Godoy counselled pardon, but on condition that Ferdinand should make, in writing, a humble, nay an abject, confession. The young prince did not hesitate at this degradation. He not only signed the required confession, but was base enough to swear eternal friendship and devotion to the Prince of the Peace. His accomplices were subjected to a trial, but acquitted by the judges, to the inexpressible rage of the Queen.

While these things were going on at Madrid, the conquest of Portugal was accomplished, and the time had arrived for the division of that kingdom, according to the Treaty of Fontainebleau. But the aspect of affairs had changed, and with them the intentions of Napoleon; or rather, the plans which he had long formed now appeared ripe for execution. "France," observes a French author, "could not remain confined by the terms of the Treaty of Fontainebleau; it was necessary to be as frivolous and as blind as the Prince of the Peace to have taken this treaty seriously. Junot's troops were evidently only the van of a much more considerable army destined to occupy and defend all the points of the

Peninsula."[2] The Prince of the Peace had been used; he was no longer good for anything; both he and the young king of Etruria were therefore sacrificed. For the division of Portugal another "combination" was substituted, destined to subjugate Spain more effectually; namely, to incorporate with France all the Spanish provinces between the Pyrenees and the Ebro, and to give Portugal to Spain, in the name of an indemnification. But it is evident that, with a French army occupying the northern provinces, the independence of the Spanish Crown was gone.

Napoleon determined to effect his object by stratagem. Towards the end of 1807 large divisions of French troops began to enter Spain at different points, apparently in a straggling manner. The strongest fortresses in the north of Spain, Figuières, Barcelona, Pampeluna, St. Sebastian, so vigorously and precisely were the Emperor's orders executed, were suddenly and simultaneously occupied, by surprise, or stratagem, or downright falsehood. In a state of war, and in difficult positions, it might be superfluous to inquire too nicely into the morality of a *ruse de guerre*. But good faith is at all events expected in time of peace; and France and Spain were not only at peace, but intimately allied together for common objects. Yet French officers did not blush to effect their ends by falsehood. Thus General Nicholas obtained admission into Figuières by telling the commandant that the arrival of the Emperor was expected; General Duhesme was received into Barcelona on his statement that he was *en route* for Valencia; General Thouvenot was admitted into St. Sebastian on his request to remain there only a few days, in order to collect his lagging and scattered troops. These arrived first in small detachments, then in larger ones, till at length they outnumbered the garrison, when the governor, discovering that he had been tricked, resigned the command of the place to Thouvenot.

The entry of the French troops into Spain, a decree of the Emperor's at Milan, December 23rd 1807, imposing a contribution of war of a hundred million francs upon Portugal, and appointing Junot governor of that country, a demand that the execution of the Treaty of Fontainebleau should be suspended, began at length to open the eyes of Godoy. He perceived that he had been duped; that the offer of the Algarves was a snare; that he had been only a tool in the hands of the French despot. At the same time he was suspected by the Spanish people of having collusively admitted the French into the northern fortresses. Thus while the support of Napoleon was withdrawn from him, he fell still deeper into the

[2] Lefèbvre, t. iii. p. 410.

hatred of his countrymen. The discontent and anger of the Spaniards, as well as the fears of the Court, were augmented when, early in March 1808, another French corps of 35,000 men, entered Vittoria. The French troops in Spain, numbering 100,000 men, were now put under the command in chief of Napoleon's brother-in-law, Murat, Grand Duke of Berg. Murat arrived at Burgos March 13th, assumed the direction of the army, and immediately marched upon Madrid.

An ignominious fall, exile, perhaps the scaffold, now rose in terrible perspective upon the mental vision of Godoy. Flight seemed to offer the only chance of safety. He counselled the King and Queen of Spain to adopt the course of the Portuguese sovereigns, and take refuge in their American possessions. The Queen at once consented. Charles IV. was more difficult to persuade; he could not believe that Napoleon intended to dethrone him. At length he yielded to the entreaties of the Queen and her paramour. It was resolved that the King should go first to Seville, from that place should demand from the French Emperor an explanation of his motives in assembling so large a force in Spain, as well as a guarantee for the security of the royal family and the independence of the kingdom. If Napoleon's answer should be unsatisfactory, Charles IV. and his family were to proceed to Cadiz and embark for America, under the protection of the English fleet that was cruising before that port. Charles having announced his determination to his council, March 15th, the disposable troops were ordered to be cantoned on the road to Andalusia to protect the journey of the royal family; but the preparations for departure, and especially an order for the garrison of Madrid to proceed to Aranjuez, having excited the suspicion of the people, large masses of armed men proceeded thither, March 17th, and amid shouts of *death to Godoy*, mingled with *vivas* for the King, prepared to prevent the departure of the sovereigns. The King, however, having again consulted his council, resolved to proceed. But Ferdinand, on leaving the council-chamber, observed to the *gardes-du-corps* on duty: "The Prince of the Peace is a traitor; he wants to carry off my father; I beseech you to stop him." These words had the desired effect. The troops, instead of protecting the flight of the royal party, now opposed it, became in fact their jailers. At night Godoy's hotel was broken open by the mob, his furniture destroyed; he himself with difficulty eluded their fury by hiding in a garret. On the morning of the 19th he was discovered, more dead than alive, by some *gardes-du-corps*, who protected him from the rage of the

populace, and Ferdinand sheltered him from further violence by undertaking that he should be brought to trial. The reign not only of the favourite but of his master also, was now at an end. On the 19th of March, Charles IV. signed at Aranjuez a solemn abdication of the crown in favour of his son, the Prince of the Asturias, who assumed the title of Ferdinand VII.

Delivered from immediate danger, Charles and his consort began to regret the throne, and attempted to recall the act of abdication. They sent a message to Murat, then some days' march from Madrid, informing him of the violence they had suffered, and conjuring him to hasten to their protection. Charles IV. also addressed a letter to Napoleon accusing his son Ferdinand of having incited the soldiery against him, and robbed him of the crown (March 21st); thus making the Emperor the arbiter of his fate. Murat arrived under the walls of Madrid, March 23rd. He was in a difficult situation, as he knew not how Napoleon would act under the new circumstances which had arisen. Conjecturing, however, that the Emperor would avail himself of the discord which reigned in the Spanish family to place a prince of his own house on the throne of Spain, a hope began to rise in Murat's breast that this prince might be himself. The other members of the Imperial family were already provided for, except Lucien, who was in disgrace. Hence Murat began to regard Ferdinand as a sort of rival. That prince had entered Madrid March 24th amidst the enthusiastic acclamations of the people, and had signified to his parents his determination to banish them to Badajoz; but Murat, at the instance of Charles and his consort, compelled Ferdinand to abandon his design. The Grand Duke of Berg would not recognise the King's abdication, spoke with contempt of Ferdinand's claim.

The revolution at Madrid had not entered into Napoleon's calculations. A very little reflection, however, determined him to use the occasion to execute the plans he had already formed, and place a prince of his own dynasty on the Spanish throne. The news of the revolution at Aranjuez arrived in Paris March 26th, and on the very next day Napoleon addressed a letter to his brother Louis, King of Holland, offering to him the crown of Spain.[3] The old sovereigns and their favourite, he reasoned, had sunk into too great a depth of contempt and hatred to allow of their restoration, while Ferdinand was of a character too base to be trusted. The Emperor, moreover, was of opinion that the

[3] *Documents hist. et réflexions sur le gouvernement de la Hollande,* par Louis Bonaparte, ex-roi de Hollande, t. ii. p. 291 sq. Thibaudeau, *Empire,* t. iii. p. 334.

marriage of that prince with one of his nieces would not afford so good a security for the subjection of Spain as the transfer of the crown to a relative of his own. But in his views of this question Napoleon omitted from his considerations a very important element—the Spanish people. The apathy of the Spaniards had indeed been so long and so profound, they appeared so deeply plunged in ignorance and superstition, so entirely dominated by bigotry and prejudice, as to be incapable of forming an opinion or exercising an independent will. But among their prejudices was a devoted attachment to the reigning dynasty. In a priest-ridden country this feeling had become almost a religion. They looked upon their monarchs as the heirs of a divine right, and felt for the youthful Ferdinand, whose despicable qualities were not publicly known, an enthusiastic loyalty. Yet in his place, a foreign prince was to be thrust upon them.

Not, however, by open force of arms. Napoleon had determined to carry the matter through, as he had begun it, by stratagem and fraud. He formed the plan of proceeding to Bayonne, enticing thither both the new King and the old, extorting the resignation of both. The hateful passions by which each was devoured were to be the means of their common ruin. The dissensions which divided father and son would seem to find their natural arbitrament and termination in an appeal to the French Emperor; the whole family might be expected to obey his summons, to enter France, and put themselves in his power. The plan, however, required dexterous handling. General Savary, afterwards Duke of Rovigo, was selected for the purpose; a devoted servant of Napoleon, equally clever and unscrupulous in laying such a plot as resolute in its execution, and who had already served his master but too well in the murder of the Duke D'Enghien. Savary arrived in Madrid April 7th, and immediately paid his respects to the abdicated King and Queen. On the following day he had an interview with Ferdinand himself, in presence of the canon Escoïquiz, the Duke de l'Infantado, and Don Pedro Cevallos; which last person had preserved under the new reign his former post of minister of foreign affairs. It is affirmed both by Cevallos and Ferdinand himself, that Savary on this occasion informed the young prince that he had been sent to compliment him, and to inquire whether he entertained towards France the same sentiments as his father; to state that, in such case, the Emperor would take no notice of what had past and would recognise him as King.[4] Savary, on the other hand, asserts that he

[4] Cevallos, *Exposé des Moyens, &c.*, p. 28 sq.; Ferdinand's Letters to his father,

acquainted Ferdinand with the Emperor's displeasure at the revolution of Aranjuez, and his determination not to adopt any course before he had come to an understanding with Charles IV.[5] It is certain, however, that instead of assuming the ambassadorial character, he retained that of a private traveller in order that, unembarrassed by etiquette, he might be the better able to deceive Ferdinand by giving him the title of King, and thus the more readily induce him to proceed to Bayonne. The exact terms of the conversation become therefore of less importance, as Savary's conduct was at all events calculated to inspire Ferdinand with the belief that Napoleon would recognise his royal title. He succeeded in persuading the young prince and the majority of his counsellors that he should proceed to meet the Emperor, who it was represented must have crossed the frontier, and would probably be found between Burgos and Vittoria.

Ferdinand set off with a small suite, including Escoïquiz, the Dukes de l'Infantado and San Carlos, Don Pedro Cevallos, Counts Altamira and de Labrador, and a few other grandees. Savary had also obtained permission to accompany him. The travellers arrived at Burgos, April 12th, but found no letter from Napoleon, no news of his approach. Savary, remarking that the Emperor could not be far off, persuaded the party to proceed to Vittoria. There also no tidings, no message; but the town was full of French troops! Ferdinand was already a prisoner in his own dominions. The new King and his little court were seized with fear and irresolution, resolved to go no further. Savary's plausible eloquence again succeeded in quieting their alarms. But it was now resolved that Ferdinand, instead of at once proceeding on his journey, should address a letter to Napoleon for Vittoria, announcing his arrival at that place, and expressing a wish to see the Emperor. Savary offered his services to convey this letter.

Napoleon arrived at Bayonne on the night of April 14th, and found Savary waiting for him. That general was again despatched towards Ferdinand early in the morning of the 16th with a reply to his letter. Napoleon had now resolved to throw off all *finesse*, for which, indeed, there was no longer any occasion; the victim was already in his nets. His letter to the prince is a strange mixture of brutality and duplicity. He plainly told him that he had no legitimate claim to the Spanish throne; that in fact he was not the son of Charles IV. but of Godoy.[6] Still, if the abdication

April 8th and May 4th 1808, ap. Lefèbvre, t. iii. p. 468.

[5] *Mém.* du Duc de Rovigo, t. iii. p. 278 sqq.

[6] "Comment d'ailleurs pourrait-on faire le procès au Prince de la Paix sans le faire

of Charles was a voluntary act, he held out hopes that he would recognise Ferdinand's accession, and expressed a wish to converse with him on the subject. He continued also to talk of the marriage with one of his nieces.[7] Yet he had already offered the throne of Spain to his brother Louis! Ferdinand hesitated to proceed on his journey, but his reluctance was again overcome by the representations of Savary, backed by the advice of the inexperienced and simple-minded canon Escoïquiz. The people of Vittoria, more sagacious than their rulers, endeavoured to prevent Ferdinand's departure, cut the traces of his mules. But he rushed blindly on to his fate.

Napoleon could not suppress his astonishment on hearing that Ferdinand had actually arrived at Bayonne. He treated the royal guest at his château of Marac with great apparent distinction and cordiality. After a banquet on April 21st, he retained the canon Escoïquiz when the other guests were departed; and had with him that celebrated conversation which has become one of the most important documents for these transactions.[8] Napoleon now entirely cast off the veil, told the canon that the House of Bourbon must vacate the Spanish throne, directed him to propose to Ferdinand an abdication to be compensated by the kingdom of Etruria and the hand of his niece, said that he would attain his ends, even if it should cost him 200,000 men. It is computed to have cost him ultimately 300,000! Such were the holocausts ruthlessly sacrificed to the ambition of a single tyrant! The canon fought stoutly for his master, but without avail. The same Savary, who only a few days before had filled Ferdinand with the hopes of his recognition, scrupled not to inform him that the Bourbons had ceased to reign in Spain. Of all Ferdinand's counsellors, Cevallos alone had courage enough to protest with dignity and vehemence against the perfidy that had been employed. He was overheard by Napoleon, who burst into the room and loaded him with abuse. Escoïquiz pressed his sovereign to accept the offers made to him; but Ferdinand, with more spirit than might have been expected, refused to give up any of his rights. He now expressed a wish to depart, but soon discovered that he was no longer at liberty.

à la reine et au roi votre père? Ce procès alimentera les haines et les passions factieuses. Ce résultat sera funeste pour votre couronne. Votre Altesse Royale n'y a de droits *que ceux que lui a transmis sa mère*. Si le procès la déshonore, V. A. R. déchire par là ses droits." Ap. Lefèbvre, t. iii. p. 392.

[7] This paragraph of the letter is suppressed as published in the *Moniteur*. Lefèbvre, t. iii. p. 480.

[8] See Escoïquiz, *Exposé, &c., Pièces Justif.*, No. iii. The conversation will also be found in Garden, t. xi. p. 142—180.

Meanwhile Napoleon had caused Murat to declare to the Supreme Junta, April 16th, that he recognised no other King than Charles IV., whose abdication had been extorted by force. A few days after Charles notified that he had again taken possession of the crown; and it was arranged that he and the Queen should proceed to Bayonne and settle their differences with their son under the mediation of the Emperor. Never was there so gross, so extensive, so successful a cozenage! To make the scene complete, the Prince of the Peace, who, at the threats of Murat, had been released from the castle of Villa-Viciosa, where he had been confined to await his trial, also arrived at Bayonne under an escort. We cannot detail the repulsive scenes, the mutual recriminations, which ensued among this degraded family. Napoleon himself could not refrain from expressing his contempt and disgust. While they were disputing one another's claims to govern, the Spanish people rose to do themselves justice. The attitude of the Grand Duke of Berg, and especially his liberation of Godoy, had excited an indescribable indignation at Madrid and other cities, which was increased by the news of Ferdinand's arrival at Bayonne. A summons from Charles IV. for his daughter, the ex-queen of Etruria, his youngest son Don Francisco de Paula and his brother, the Infant Don Antonio, also to repair thither added fresh materials for dissatisfaction. Charles's second son, Don Carlos, had accompanied Ferdinand. The people rose to prevent the departure of the princes. Murat dispersed them with musket-bullets and grape-shot, May 2nd. The populace of Madrid despatched all the French they could lay hands on, even the sick in the hospitals. Thus was inaugurated that deadly international struggle which was to last several years.

Napoleon made use of this insurrection to extort from the Spanish sovereigns a renunciation of the crown. He charged Ferdinand with being the author of it; the parents of that prince shared, or affected to share, the convictions of the Emperor. With the bitterest reproaches and imprecations, Charles demanded from his son an unconditional abdication; his mother even raised her hand to strike him. Napoleon closed the scene declaring that the bloodshed at Madrid had put an end to his irresolution, that he would never recognise as King of Spain a man who had ordered the massacre of his soldiers.[9] The insurrection at Madrid of

[9] According to Cevallos, *Exposé, &c.*, p. 52, Napoleon put an end to Ferdinand's hesitation by exclaiming, "Prince, you must choose between abdication or death." Escoïquiz adds, that the same threat was made to Don Carlos and Don Antonio, through Duroc, if they would not renounce their right of succession. It cannot, therefore, be believed that Napoleon's offer to re-establish Charles IV., if ever made, was anything more than an empty compliment.

May 2nd, appears to have been a spontaneous ebullition, caused by the departure of the Infants. Ferdinand had indeed given a written authority, May 5th, for a rising against the French, to two deputies of the Supreme Junta, who had contrived to make their way in disguise to Bayonne;[10] but this of course was totally unconnected with the insurrection in question. Napoleon offered, it is said, to reconduct Charles IV. to Madrid, but Charles refused again to assume the crown. Ferdinand, for whom there was no escape, who had lost all, even the kingdom of Etruria, delivered his written abdication, May 6th. Charles IV., without waiting for it, had concluded with Napoleon the evening before the famous Treaty of Bayonne. For the château of Chambord, of which he could not take possession, and a pension of seven and a half million francs, which was never paid, he exchanged the monarchy of Spain and the Indies. The ancient and renowned Spanish nation was bartered away like a flock of sheep. Charles stipulated only two conditions: that the territorial integrity of Spain should be preserved, and that the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman religion should be the only one tolerated in the kingdom. (Art. 2.)[11] A few days before signing this act, Charles had appointed the Grand Duke of Berg his lieutenant-general for the government of Spain. Ferdinand having confirmed and adhered to the cession of his father by an act signed May 10th, the Emperor made over to him the domain and palace of Navarre, and engaged to pay him and his descendants out of the French revenues an annual pension of 400,000 francs.[12] By a treaty with Joseph Bonaparte, these and other pensions, as well as the value of the estates granted, were however to be drawn from the Spanish revenues.[13] The Infants Don Antonio and Don Carlos adhered to these renunciations. To render them complete on the part of the Spanish Bourbons two signatures were still wanting: that of Ferdinand IV. King of the Two Sicilies, and brother of Charles IV., and that of Don Pedro, son of Gabriel, younger brother of those two monarchs.[14] But a still more solemn sanction was also wanting—that of the Spanish nation; which, thus abandoned by its sovereigns, was reinstated in its primitive right of election. A little after the signature of the treaty, Charles IV., his Queen, the Queen of Etruria and the Prince of the Peace, were conducted to Compiègne, which had been assigned to them for a residence; but, the climate not

[10] Lefèbvre, t. iii. p. 499.
[11] See the treaty in Garden, t. xi. p. 181 sqq.
[12] *Ibid.* p. 184 sqq.
[13] *Ibid.* p. 192.
[14] Don Pedro, who had married the eldest daughter of the Portuguese Regent, accompanied him to Brazil, where he died, June 4th 1812.

agreeing with the old King, he subsequently took up his abode at Marseilles. Here he was entirely neglected by the French Government, and compelled to sell his diamonds to procure the necessaries of life. Ferdinand and Don Carlos, instead of obtaining the castle of Navarre, were transferred to the château of Valençai as the place of their imprisonment; a domain which Napoleon appropriated to this purpose without the consent of Prince Talleyrand, the proprietor.

Murat was disappointed of the crown of Spain, on which he had fixed his hopes. It had been refused with surprise and indignation by Napoleon's brother Louis, who wore reluctantly even that of Holland, but was unwilling to exchange it for a still deeper royal servitude. Joseph Bonaparte, however, consented to abandon his more tranquil throne of Naples for the dangers and discontents which surrounded that of Spain. Napoleon, who had nominated him to it June 6th, was desirous of procuring at least the apparent consent of the Spanish nation. The Council of Castile, the chief political body of Spain, when informed of the Treaties of Bayonne, was at last induced to give a cold and reluctant assent to the accession of Joseph. Its example was followed by the Supreme Junta and the municipality of Madrid. There was, indeed, no alternative but war. Ferdinand displayed on the occasion all the baseness of his soul in its true colours. He not only wrote to Napoleon to express his satisfaction at the elevation of Joseph, he even addressed a letter of congratulation to the man who had usurped his crown! thus testifying under his own hand his utter unworthiness to wear it. A Junta of 150 Spanish notables, which had been summoned to Bayonne, accepted a constitution proposed by Napoleon, July 7th, and a day or two after Joseph left Bayonne for Madrid. He had signed on the 5th a treaty with his brother Napoleon, by which he renounced the crown of Naples, made, as King of Spain, a perpetual offensive alliance with France, fixed the number of troops and ships to be provided by each nation, and agreed to the establishment of a commercial system.[15] By an act called *Constitutional Statute*, July 15th, the vacant throne of Naples was bestowed upon Joachim Murat.[16]

Ferdinand had found means to despatch from Bayonne a proclamation addressed to the Asturians, and dated May 8th, in which he called upon them to assert their independence and never to submit to the perfidious enemy who had deprived him of his rights. This letter naturally made a great impression on a proud and sensitive people; nor was its effect diminished by another

[15] Garden, t. xi. p. 190 sqq. [16] *Ibid.* p. 199.

proclamation which Ferdinand and his brothers were compelled to sign at Bordeaux, May 12th, calling upon the Spaniards not to oppose "the beneficent views" of Napoleon. At this last address, evidently extorted from a prisoner, a general cry of indignation arose in Spain; the people everywhere flew to arms, except where prevented by the presence of French troops. The city of Valencia renounced its obedience to the Government of Madrid, May 23rd; Seville followed its example, and on the 27th, Joseph Palafox organised at Saragossa the insurrection of Aragon. As these insurrections were accompanied with frightful massacres, principally of persons who had held high civil or military posts under Charles IV., the better classes, to put an end to these horrible scenes, established central Juntas in the principal towns. That of Seville, rejecting the authority of the capital, as being in the hands of the enemy, assumed the exercise of an independent power in the name of Ferdinand VII. On the 29th of May it published a proclamation, calling on the people to defend their country, their king, their laws, and property; and on the 6th of June it declared war upon Napoleon in the name of Ferdinand VII.[17] Addresses of the same kind were published in various other places.

A popular historian has attributed both the proximate and the primary causes of the calamities which overwhelmed Spain entirely to the imbecility, the corruption, and the despotism of the government, and the superstition and bigotry of the people, which "sapped the foundation of military and civil virtue, and prepared the way for invasion."[18] We hardly think that these can be the true causes. The Lutheranism and learning of the Germans, the Calvinism and republican principles of the Dutch and Swiss, previously two of the freest nations of Europe, did not save them from being subjugated by the invader; nay, we think it may be more correctly asserted that the adoption of the French revolutionary doctrines by great numbers in those countries was much more favourable to an invasion than the disgust with which those doctrines were rejected by the Spaniards. The true causes of the calamities which overtook Spain were the boundless and unhallowed ambition, the unexampled and inconceivable perfidy, of Napoleon. And how can it be true that the Spaniards were destitute of all civil and military virtue? Can there be a greater proof of those virtues than to rise in arms against the oppressor of

[17] These papers will be found in Garden, t. xi. p. 205 sqq.

[18] Napier, *Hist. of the War in the Peninsula*, Preface.

one's country? And was it not the Spaniards alone who had the spirit to organise anything like a national resistance against Napoleon? Ancient prejudices may be deplorable; but even the worst things sometimes have their uses. The Spaniards had at least preserved a national character and a love for their country, which in many other nations had been nearly destroyed by the new French philosophy. The true mean lay no doubt between the civil and religious bigotry of the Spaniards, and the extravagance and atheism of the French republicans. Yet if the results of these opposite principles be contrasted, the comparison will not be altogether disadvantageous to Spain. This has been done with a great deal of force by Palafox, in his famous letter to the French general, Lefèbvre Desnouettes.[19] The Dutch and Prussians, he observes, had no monks, yet they had fallen almost without resistance. Even the Inquisition in its worst times had never committed a tithe of the atrocities of the Marats, the Robespierres, and other leaders of the French Revolution; nor could the political subjection of the Spaniards be worse than that of the French, who followed a Corsican adventurer, like a flock of sheep, wherever he might choose to lead them to the slaughter. The Spaniards, no doubt, committed many faults in the war of liberation. They were perhaps proud, boastful, cruel when provoked, inconstant, inamenable to discipline; but let it be remembered, to their honour, that they were the first continental nation that rose against the tyrant, and initiated a movement by which he was at last overthrown.

Spain, when she declared war, had scarcely an army.[20] It is true that, including the provincial militias, she had on foot about 100,000 men; but of these 15,000 were in Denmark, 35,000 in Portugal, and for the most part under the command of Junot; 30,000 were absorbed by the garrisons of the fortresses of Africa, the Balearic Isles, the Canaries, and the interior. Half of the remaining 20,000 were in Galicia, and became the nucleus of the insurrectionary army of the North; the other 10,000, destined for the siege of Gibraltar, were in the camp of St. Roque, and laid the foundation of the army of Andalusia. But the indignation and enthusiasm of the Spaniards permitted them not to count the disparity of numbers. On the other hand, they were aware that

[19] See Garden, t. xi. p. 238 sqq.

[20] Space will not allow us to enter into the details of the Peninsular War. We can only indicate the main results. The subject almost forms part of our own history, and most English readers are familiar with it from the works of Southey and Napier, the *Despatches of the Duke of Wellington*, and other works. Foy's *Hist. de la Guerre de la Péninsule* is also a standard book on the subject.

it was impossible for a French army, however numerous, to occupy all the fortresses and ports of their extensive country; whose surface, too, as well as climate, present formidable difficulties to an invader. Above all, they reckoned on the method of conducting the war. They proposed not to meet the enemy in pitched battles in the open field, but to harass, wear out, and overcome him by *guerilla*,[21] or the discursive and incessant attacks of separate small bands. The Supreme Junta issued instructions for conducting this mode of warfare. Andalusia was better fitted for organising the revolt, if such it can be called, than any other province of Spain. Its population formed one-fifth of the whole nation, it possessed the sole cannon-foundry in the kingdom, it contained half the disposable Spanish army, and it could receive assistance from the English both by means of Gibraltar and of Collingwood's fleet that was cruising on the coast.

One of the first feats of arms of the Spaniards was to compel the surrender of five French ships of the line and a frigate, which had remained in the port of Cadiz ever since the battle of Trafalgar (June 14th). Marshal Moncey was repulsed towards the end of June in an advance upon Valencia, and compelled to retreat upon Madrid with a loss of one-third of his men. In the north-west the Spaniards were less fortunate. Cuesta, with a corps of 25,000 men, was defeated by Marshal Bessières, July 14th, at Medina del Rio Seco. The consequence of this victory was the temporary submission of Leon, Palencia, Valladolid, Zamora, and Salamanca to the French. But this misfortune was more than counterbalanced by the victory of General Castaños over the French in Andalusia, a few days after. Generals Dupont and Vedel had advanced into that province as far as Cordova, but they were defeated by Castaños with the army of Andalusia at BAYLEN, July 20th. On this occasion, the commencement of the French reverses in Spain, 18,000 French soldiers laid down their arms. Joseph Bonaparte found it prudent to leave Madrid, August 1st, which he had only entered on the day of the battle, and fly to Burgos. This important victory not only inspired the Spaniards with confidence, but also caused them to be regarded in Europe as a substantive Power. On the day after the battle Castaños issued a proclamation which does him great honour. He invoked the Spaniards to show humanity towards the French prisoners of war, and threatened to shoot those who should maltreat them.[22]

[21] Literally, *little warfare*.

[22] See the Proclamation in Garden, p. 237.

Such, however, was the exasperation of the people against their invaders, that numbers of the French were massacred on their route to Cadiz for embarkation, and the remainder were treated with barbarous inhumanity. These cruelties had, however, been provoked by the atrocities of the French at the capture and sack of Cordova.[23]

The campaign in Aragon was still more glorious for the Spaniards. Palafox, whether or not he was the poltroon described by Napier, had at all events the merit of organising, out of almost nothing, the means by which the French were repulsed in several desperate assaults upon Saragossa, and at length compelled to retreat after a siege of some weeks (August 14th). The patriot cause was soon after strengthened by the arrival at Corunna of General La Romana, with 7000 of his men from Denmark, (Sept. 20th). Keats, the English admiral in the Baltic, had informed him of the rising of his countrymen and provided him the means to transport his troops from Nyborg. The English Government, soon after the breaking out of the insurrection, had proclaimed a peace with the Spanish nation (July 4th 1808), and had prepared to assist them in their heroic struggle. The example of Spain had also encouraged the Portuguese to throw off the insufferable yoke of the French. A Junta was established at Oporto, June 6th, and an insurrection was organised in all parts of the kingdom where the French forces were not predominant. Sir Arthur Wellesley, with about 10,000 British troops, landed at Mondego Bay, July 31st, and being joined by General Spencer from Cadiz, with 5000 men, advanced upon Lisbon. Laborde, who attempted to oppose them at Roliça with a much smaller force but in a very strong position, was compelled to retreat after a warm action, and the march was resumed. Junot now advanced with his whole disposable force from Lisbon, about 14,000 men with 26 guns. The British were stronger by 2000, without including the Portuguese regiments, but were far inferior in cavalry and artillery. Sir Harry Burrard had now arrived, who took the chief command of the British, and thwarted all the plans of Sir A. Wellesley. The hostile armies met before the town of Vimeira, August 21st, when Junot was completely defeated, with the loss of 2000 men, 400 prisoners, and 13 guns. But the fruits of the victory were in a great measure lost by the refusal of Sir Harry Burrard to pursue the enemy. A day or two after Sir Harry was in turn superseded by the arrival of Sir Hew Dalrymple from Gibraltar. It was now determined to advance against Junot, who had occupied the strong

[23] Foy, *Guerre de la Péninsule*, t. iii. p. 230 sq.

position of Torres Vedras. But the French general proposed an armistice; and by the *Convention of Cintra*,[24] August 30th, he was allowed to evacuate Portugal with all his forces, which were to be transported to France by the English and allowed to serve wherever they might be required. Before their departure, the French, from the general-in-chief down to the private, were compelled to disgorge an enormous amount of plunder which they were preparing to carry off. The Convention of Cintra was followed by the surrender of Admiral Siniavin and the Russian squadron in the Tagus to Admiral Sir Charles Cotton. The Convention of Cintra was received with such disapprobation in England that the three generals were recalled and arraigned before a court of inquiry; by which, however, they were acquitted. During their absence in England, the command of the British forces in Portugal was bestowed on Sir John Moore, who had arrived from the Baltic with his division.

The commotions in Spain and Portugal required for their suppression large reinforcements to be drawn from Napoleon's veteran troops in Germany. But as this movement might expose him to a rising of the Germans, and especially of the Austrians, he resolved to guard against that danger by drawing closer his alliance with the Emperor of Russia. Alexander accepted an invitation to meet the Emperor of the French at Erfurt, at which place the two sovereigns arrived, Sept. 27th. The congress, which lasted nearly three weeks, was conducted with the greatest splendour, but at the same time with marks of the most entire friendship and confidence between the two emperors. It was attended by the Kings of Bavaria, Saxony, Würtemberg and Westphalia, by Alexander's brother the Grand Duke of Constantine, Prince William of Prussia, the Grand Duke of Baden, the Duke of Saxe Weimar, and most of the principal sovereigns of Germany. The palaces occupied by Alexander and Napoleon were furnished in the most splendid and luxurious manner at the expense of France. Napoleon entertained every day at dinner the principal sovereigns, and in the evening French plays were performed by the most celebrated actors of the Parisian theatres. The entertainments were diversified by a visit to Weimar, where Napoleon made the acquaintance of Wieland, Göthe, and other celebrated German authors. The political objects of the conference were arranged by a secret convention signed October 12th.[25] The most important

[24] Martens, *Nouv. Rec.*, t. i. p. 94.

[25] This Convention has never been authentically published, but an analysis of it will be found in Garden, t. xi. p. 286 sqq.

articles were, that Alexander consented to Joseph Bonaparte's elevation to the throne of Spain, as well as to the changes which had been made in Italy, and promised to make common cause with France in case of a declaration of war by Austria. In return for these concessions, Napoleon engaged not to oppose the annexation of Moldavia, Wallachia, and Finland to the Russian Empire. The two monarchs are said to have agreed to constitute themselves, at some future time, one Emperor of the West, the other Emperor of the East, and that the Elbe should form the limit of their respective dominions.[26] The partition of Turkey was discussed, but Napoleon represented this enterprise as at present inopportune. Alexander obtained for the King of Prussia a reduction of twenty million francs from the sum payable by that sovereign, and the evacuation by the French troops of the Prussian dominions.

Alexander and Napoleon, shortly before they quitted Erfurt, addressed a joint note to King George III., expressing a desire for peace (October 12th 1808). This was followed up by notes from Count Roumantsof and M. de Champagny, the Russian and French foreign ministers, to Mr. Canning, proposing the *uti possidetis* as a base of negociations, and offering to confer with the plenipotentiaries of Great Britain in any continental town. The English Government insisted that the Spanish nation, represented by its Junta, acting in the name of Ferdinand VII., should be a party to the negociations; but Count Roumantsof rejected this admission of what he called the "Spanish insurgents," announced that his master had recognised Joseph Bonaparte as King of Spain, and would not separate his interests from those of his ally Napoleon. The French minister also replied in an insolent note, in which he compared the admission of the Spaniards to a congress with that of the insurgent Catholics of Ireland—as if Spain had irrevocably become a subordinate part of the French Empire. A peace on the terms proposed was of course inadmissible. Mr. Canning, in his reply to M. de Champagny, abstained, by express command of the King, from noticing the insulting expressions in the French note, but expressed His Majesty's firm determination not to abandon the cause of the Spanish nation, nor to acquiesce in a usurpation unparalleled in the history of the world. The English Cabinet was supported in this resolution by the hope that Austria would before long declare against Napoleon.

Meanwhile in Spain, a Supreme Central Junta, under the presidency of Count Florida Blanca, had been organised at Aranjuez

[26] Garden, t. xi. p. 281; on the authority of a statesman well acquainted with the events of that period.

towards the end of September. It was formed of two deputies from each provincial Junta, and it was hoped that by this means the insurrection would be conducted with more concert and vigour. Unfortunately, however, it had the contrary effect. The provincial Juntas intrusted to their deputies only a very limited and subordinate authority, who were thus prevented from acting with the vigour and decision required by the conjuncture. The armed force was now divided into three corps. The first of these, called the "army of the North," was commanded by Blake, having under his orders the Marquis de la Romana. The Junta gave out that this corps consisted of 55,000 men, when it is probable that it did not count more than 17,000 regular troops. This method of exaggeration, which was systematically adopted by the Junta, had the effect of sometimes leading their English allies into great difficulties and dangers. In like manner the army of the centre under Castaños was rated at 65,000 men, and that of Aragon, under Joseph Palafox, at 20,000. The French army, reduced to about 50,000 men, had now fixed its headquarters at Vittoria. Its right was commanded by Gouvion St. Cyr, the centre by Marshal Moncey, the left by Marshals Ney, Bessières, and Lefèbvre. The French, however, were rapidly reinforced by the troops withdrawn from Prussia, and by auxiliary corps forwarded by King Jerôme and other dependent German sovereigns; so that before the end of the year they numbered 180,000 men. Napoleon placed himself at the head of his armies early in November. A succession of victories, achieved by his generals under his direction, opened to him the road to the Spanish capital. On the 7th of November Lefèbvre defeated Blake and La Romana at Guenez. On the 10th Soult gained a victory over the Count de Belvedere and a division of the army of Blake at Gamonal, while on the same and following day, Blake and La Romana were defeated by Victor at Espinosa. On the 15th, Napoleon's headquarters were at Burgos. On the 23rd Lannes and Victor defeated Castaños at Tudela, and on the 30th Napoleon in person overthrew the reserve of the Spaniards, under Count San Juan, in the defiles of the Somo-Sierra. On the 2nd of December, the fourth anniversary of his coronation, the French Emperor appeared under the walls of Madrid, and took up his abode at Chamartin, belonging to the Duke de l'Infantado. The inhabitants of the capital seemed at first disposed to resist, but thought better of it, and Madrid was entered by the French troops on the morning of December 4th.

On the same day that he took possession of the Spanish capital Napoleon issued decrees abolishing the Inquisition, reducing by

two-thirds the number of convents in Spain, and enabling monks to become secular ecclesiastics, suppressing all feudal rights and personal service, abolishing the existing provincial barriers, and transferring all custom-houses to the frontiers of the kingdom.

Meanwhile the English were marching into the heart of Spain. Sir David Baird having arrived at Corunna, October 13th, with 15,000 men, Sir John Moore, at the head of the English troops in Portugal, advanced by Salamanca to form a junction with him, which was effected at Mayorga, December 20th. The total number of the British in the Peninsula was now 35,000; but some regiments had been left behind, others detached, and, deducting the sick, the total of effective men under Sir John Moore was only between 23,000 and 24,000 with 60 guns. Moore had been lured to advance by false accounts of the position of things, of the resources and enthusiasm of the Spaniards. It was still more calculated to deceive him that most of the accounts of this nature came from Mr. Frere, the British minister at Madrid. Moore was advancing with his small army to certain destruction against Napoleon with eight times his force. At the news of his advance the French Emperor left Madrid and marched against him at the head of his choicest troops. Moore had now no alternative but to commence his famous retreat. The manœuvres of Soult had cut him off from the road to Portugal, and the march was therefore directed into Galicia. Napoleon, having learnt on the road to Astorga of the events that were preparing in Germany, immediately set off for Paris, leaving the command of the pursuing army to Soult. That commander pressed upon and harassed the British, who are said to have committed great disorders in their retreat; but he ventured not to accept the battle which Moore offered him at Lugo. The British, after suffering great hardships, arived at Corunna January 14th 1809. Here they were detained two or three days by the want of vessels, and meanwhile Soult came up. An action was fought before that town, January 16th, in which the French were entirely defeated; but this victory was dearly purchased with the life of the gallant Sir John Moore, who was mortally wounded with a cannon-ball. Sir David Baird had also been disabled. The transports had now arrived from Vigo, and the British army was safely embarked. Corunna, which was defended a few days by the Spaniards, surrendered January 19th. Soult then applied himself to the reduction of Galicia.

Moore's expedition was undertaken without proper information by order of the English Ministry; but so far as the general himself was concerned, it was conducted with the greatest skill and bravery.

Nor, though it failed, was it altogether useless. The march of the French into the south of Spain was arrested, their army fatigued and ruined to such an extent that for several months they were unable to undertake anything of importance. In the very midst of this misfortune a treaty was concluded between Great Britain and the Supreme Junta, January 14th 1809, by which the former Power engaged to assist the Spanish nation with all its forces, and to recognise no other King of Spain than Ferdinand VII.[27]

Napoleon's departure from the Peninsula had been occasioned by the military preparations of Austria. The Peace of Presburg had been so humiliating to that Power as to render it certain that she would seize the first favourable opportunity to appeal again to arms. For this appeal she had long been silently preparing. She had endeavoured to place her finances on a better footing, and she had succeeded in reorganising a formidable military force. The latter task had been intrusted to the Archduke Charles, who in the summer of 1808 succeeded in establishing the *Landwehr*, or militia, a novel description of force in the Austrian dominions. The German provinces alone furnished 300,000 men to the Landwehr, besides a reserve of 60,000. At the same time the troops of the line were carried to 400,000 men, divided into nine corps, each under its general in chief. The Hungarians, animated by a friendly spirit, voted in 1808 an increase of 80,000 troops, and offered besides, in case of need, a permanent insurrection of 80,000 more, of which 30,000 were to be cavalry. In case of reverses, Komorn in Hungary was selected as a *place d'armes*.

These preparations had not escaped the attention of Napoleon, who, in August 1808, had angrily remonstrated with Count Metternich, the Austrian ambassador at Paris, against the preparations of his sovereign. Austria was excluded from the conferences at Erfurt, but Napoleon's mind seems to have been in some degree tranquillised by a correspondence which ensued at this time between himself and the Emperor Francis. There were, however, several circumstances which obscurely indicated the intentions of the Cabinet of Vienna. Austrian agents were known to be in communication with the Spanish patriots; a party among the latter had even offered the crown of Spain to the Archduke Charles.[28] The Court of Vienna had hesitated to recognise Joseph

[27] Martens, *N. R.*, t. i. p. 163.

[28] It was affirmed by the French minister, M. de Champagny, that Admiral Collingwood, the British commander in the Mediterranean, actually offered to place a frigate at the disposal of the Archduke at Trieste, to convoy him to Spain. But this is at variance with the acknowledgment of Ferdinand VII. by the English Government. See Garden, t. xii. p. 11.

Bonaparte; had authorised the sale of the *Memoir* of Cevallos, which unmasked Napoleon's Spanish intrigues; had instructed its internuncio at Constantinople to assist in reconciling the Porte with Great Britain. A still more direct evidence of the intentions of Austria was a passage in the speech of the King of England on opening Parliament, December 15th 1808.

As nothing could be more adverse to Napoleon's Spanish projects than a war with Austria, he attempted to avert it by proposing a triple agreement between France, Russia, and Austria, which should give to Austria the guarantee of Russia against the enterprises of France, and that of France against the attempts of Russia. But this proposition was not accepted. At Valladolid, on his way from Madrid, Napoleon wrote to the sovereigns of the Rhenish League to complete and mobilize their contingents. Towards the end of February 1809 the French troops were in motion. Austria at the same time was pressing on her armaments. On the 27th of March the Austrian minister delivered to the French Government a declaration, in which were enumerated all the insults and injuries Austria had suffered at the hands of France since the Peace of Presburg. This was followed soon after by a regular manifest, and by an admirable order of the day addressed to the army by the Archduke Charles, the generalissimo (April 6th). Addresses were also published by the Emperor and the Archduke to the Austrians, and to the German nation in general, which were answered by counter-proclamations from the Kings of Bavaria, Würtemberg and Saxony, and other sovereigns of the Confederation of the Rhine.

The war which ensued has sometimes, but improperly, been called the Fifth Coalition. There were no regular treaties between Great Britain and Austria; but it is believed that the English Government agreed to furnish subsidies of more than four million sterling, and had promised to make a diversion on the coasts of France or in the north of Germany. But the war did not last long enough for the execution of these schemes.[29]

Six of the nine divisions of the Austrian army, comprising upwards of 200,000 men, had been assembled in Bohemia under the Archduke Charles, with the intention of attacking the French in Germany, and driving them over the Rhine before they could receive assistance from France. But, with the usual Austrian slowness, the opportunity was lost. Two divisions only, under Bellegarde and Kolowrat, entered the Upper Palatinate and marched upon Ratisbon. The main force proceeded into Austria

[29] Garden, t. xii. p. 79.

in order to enter Bavaria by the accustomed route along the Danube. The seventh Austrian division of 36,000 men, under the Archduke Ferdinand d'Este, was to enter Poland. The eighth and ninth, commanded in chief by the Archduke John, were destined for the invasion of Italy. The French opposed to these Davoust's corps at Ratisbon, that of Masséna at Ulm, that of Oudinot at Augsburg, three Bavarian divisions at Munich, Landshut and Straubing, under Marshal Lefèbvre, the Würtemberg division at Heidenheim commanded by Vandamme, and the grand army, whose headquarters were at Strasburg: the whole comprising 212,000 men, exclusive of the Saxons under Bernadotte, and 12,000 Poles under Prince Poniatowski. The French army in Italy consisted of Macdonald's, Grenier's, and Baraguay d'Hilliers' divisions, 70,000 men, under the command-in-chief of the Viceroy Eugène.

It was hoped that when hostilities commenced, the Germans would rise against their French oppressors; but this expectation was realised only in the Tyrol. Some Tyrolese had gone secretly to Vienna, to pledge themselves to that effect; and no sooner had the war begun, April 10th, than the insurrection broke out. Beacons were lighted on the mountain-tops; meal, blood, or saw-dust cast upon the streams, carried into every valley the signal for arming. On the road between Brixen and Innsbrück the French columns were surprised; more than 8000 of their men were either killed or made prisoners. A bloody fight took place in Innsbrück; the Bavarians who garrisoned it were driven out, their commander killed. At Wiltau, an entire French brigade was compelled to surrender. All this was the work of four days. The leaders of the Tyrolese were Andrew Hofer, an innkeeper in the Passeierthal, Spechbacher, Haspinger, a Capuchin monk, Eisenstecken and Ennemoser. When the Marquis von Chasteler entered the Tyrol with a small Austrian corps, the country was already liberated; Kufstein alone remained in possession of the Bavarians.[30] The insurrection also spread to the Vorarlberg.

The main body of the Austrian army crossed the Inn and invaded Bavaria, April 10th 1809. On the 16th, they forced the passage of the Isar and entered Munich. The King of Bavaria had fled at their approach. Napoleon, on the other hand, by April 18th had carried his headquarters to Ingolstadt. On the following day a bloody but indecisive combat took place at Tann; the French, however, succeeded in forming a junction with the Bavarians. On the 20th, Napoleon defeated the Archduke Louis at Abensberg, and

[30] Mailath, B. v. S. 288 f.

separated him from the army of the generalissimo. But on the same day the Archduke Charles had taken Ratisbon, which made him master of the Danube, and put him in communication with the corps of Bellegarde, advancing from Bohemia. The Archduke then marched along the right bank of the river, and took up a position at Eckmühl. Napoleon, who had pursued the Archduke Louis and again defeated him at Landshut, now turned against the generalissimo and defeated him in a decisive battle at Eckmühl, April 22nd. The Austrians having retreated into Ratisbon, which was entered by the French the following day, a bloody battle ensued, during which a great part of the town was burnt. The Archduke Charles now retreated through the Upper Palatinate, while Napoleon, instead of pursuing him, directed his forces against Vienna. General Hiller with an Austrian corps was attacked and defeated at Ebersberg near Linz, May 3rd, by the divisions of Bessières and Oudinot. During the battle the town took fire, and many of the combatants perished in the flames. On May 10th, Marshal Lannes appeared before Vienna. The Archduke Maximilian, brother of the Empress, after a vain attempt to defend it, passed the Danube with 4000 men on the night of the 11th, and next day Vienna capitulated. Napoleon now for the second time took up his residence at Schönbrunn. Hence he issued an order dissolving the *Landwehr*, and granting a pardon to all who should return to their homes within a fortnight. He also published a proclamation addressed to the Hungarians, May 15th, in which he called upon them to renounce their allegiance to the House of Austria, promised them freedom and independence, and exhorted them to choose a king of their own. But the Hungarians were at that time well affected towards the Imperial family, and this proclamation had no effect.

Before relating the final catastrophe of the campaign in the Marchfeld, we must briefly advert to the subsidiary operations of the war in other quarters. The sudden success of the Tyrolese was but of short duration. Marshal Lefèbvre compelled them to relinquish the siege of Kufstein, defeated the Austrians at Mörgel, May 13th, took Schwatz by assault, 15th, and on the 19th occupied Innsbrück. The Tyrolese, yielding to superior force, feigned submission, and sent deputies to Munich to solicit a pardon. But no sooner had the French and Austrians withdrawn, leaving behind only Deroy's division, than the Tyrolese again flew to arms, attacked Deroy, and compelled him to retreat to Kufstein. Chasteler also again entered the Tyrol to reinforce an Austrian corps which had entrenched itself on the Brenner. But these successes were again interrupted by the armistice of Znaim, July 11th,

which we shall have to record further on. On the side of Poland, the Archduke Ferdinand, marching from Galicia, occupied Warsaw, April 22nd, and penetrated as far as Thorn. The Austrians had brought 100 guns, in the hope of inducing the King of Prussia to join them; but without effect. Prince Schwarzenberg had been sent on a special mission to St. Petersburg to conciliate the Emperor, who, it was hoped, even if he did not actually assist them, would at all events remain neutral. But Alexander adhered, though somewhat lukewarmly, to his French alliance, and placed a division at Napoleon's disposal, who, with some Polish troops, were directed upon Galicia. The Russo-Polish army drove the Austrians from Leopol and Sandomir, and took possession of Galicia, where the French eagles were planted by Prince Poniatowski. Ferdinand retired into Hungary, and at length the armistice of July 11th between the main armies put an end also to the war in this quarter. In Franconia, the efforts of the Austrians to excite a rising of the population proved only partially successful; and they were compelled to evacuate that district on the approach of Junot's division.

In Italy, hostilities had begun at the same time as in Germany. The Archduke John defeated the Viceroy Eugène at Sacile, April 16th, who then retired to Caldiero on the Adige. But the arrival of a French division from Tuscany, and the news received from Germany, decided the Archduke to commence his retreat by the end of April. It was hastened by a decisive battle on the Piave, May 8th, in which the Austrians were defeated by Eugène. The latter general passed the Isonzo, May 14th, and seized Gortz and Laybach. Here he was joined by Marmont, the commander of the French in Dalmatia; who, leaving only between 4000 and 5000 men behind, forced with the remainder the passage of the Fiume, and effected a junction with the army of Italy. The Archduke John retired into Hungary, where he joined the Archduke Palatine, commanding the Hungarian troops, June 13th. But Eugène, profiting by the discordant views of those commanders, gained a signal victory over them near Raab, June 14th. Raab capitulated on the 22nd, and Davoust bombarded Presburg on the 26th. The Archduke had retired to Comorn, and Eugène proceeded to form a junction with the army of Napoleon. We now return to the operations of the main armies.

The Archduke Charles after his defeat at Eckmühl had pursued his march down the left bank of the Danube towards Vienna, and had taken up a position to the north of that capital on the plain called the Marchfeld; a spot rendered famous in ancient times by

the defeat and death of Ottocar, King of Bohemia (August 1278), and the triumph of Rodolph of Habsburg, the founder of the House of Austria. On this plain the fate of Austria was again to be decided. The Archduke had been joined by Hiller with his corps, who had contrived to pass the Danube at Krems. The Austrian army after this junction numbered about 75,000 men. At the Marchfeld the Danube separates into three branches, of which the two northernmost form the large and well-wooded island of Lobau. Of this isle the French had taken possession, in order to throw a bridge over the river between the villages of Aspern and Essling. This operation, which was not interrupted by the Austrians, was completed on the night of May 20th, and on the 21st and 22nd Napoleon engaged the Austrians. These battles, which are called the battles of Aspern and Essling, or when spoken of jointly the battle of the Marchfeld, were fought with great obstinacy and fury, but without any very decisive advantage on either side. On the whole, however, the Austrians were superior; as Napoleon was compelled to abandon the field, and withdraw his troops into the isle of Lobau. It was the first repulse which he had experienced in Germany. The loss on both sides was enormous. The Austrians acknowledge to have had 24,000 men killed and wounded.[31] The loss of the French was no doubt a great deal more; yet Napoleon stated it at only 1100 killed and 3000 wounded![32] Among the killed were Marshal Lannes, and three general officers. Napoleon is said to have abandoned his army in the moment of danger, and to have crossed over to the right bank of the Danube, leaving Masséna to secure the retreat.[33] The Austrians, aided by a swell in the river, succeeded in destroying the two bridges which connected the isle of Lobau with the right bank and Vienna, and the French were thus left more than two days without provisions. But on the 25th they re-established the bridges, and on the following day Eugène, with the army of Italy, crossed the Semmering, and formed a junction with them.

The Archduke Charles continued to maintain a position on the left bank of the Danube extending from Krems to Presburg. The two armies lay for some weeks inactive. Besides Macdonald, with part of the army of Italy, Napoleon had also been joined by Bernadotte with the Saxons, and by Marmont's corps; which raised his forces to an equality with those of the Archduke. On July 1st he established his headquarters in the isle of Lobau, which had

[31] The Archduke Charles' report of these battles, from the Austrian Archives, will be found in Mailath, *Gesch. des östr. Kaiserstaats*, B. v. S. 295—310.

[32] Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 404.

[33] *Ibid.* p. 405.

been strongly fortified. On the 4th he battered down the village of Enzersdorf, and established a bridge over the Danube at that point. On the 5th and 6th was fought the battle of WAGRAM. Never in any battle upon land had so formidable an artillery been employed. The Austrians had 500 guns, many of large calibre. The French were inferior in this arm, having only about 400. The first day was indecisive; on the second the Austrians were defeated. The Archduke Charles, mistaking the French plans, had too much weakened his centre; and his left wing was deprived of the support which he had expected from the Archduke John, who did not come up from Hungary till two hours after the battle. On both these points the Austrians were turned, but they commenced an orderly retreat by way of Guntersdorf towards Bohemia. The defeat of their left wing had cut them off from Hungary. Their rear guard was defeated at Hollabrunn by Masséna, July 10th. On the following day Napoleon in person appeared before Znaim, where the Archduke Charles had established his headquarters. A warm action ensued, in the course of which Prince Liechtenstein obtained from Napoleon an armistice. In the battles between the 5th and 11th, both armies had suffered terribly. The Austrians had lost 23,000 men killed and 7000 prisoners; the loss of the French was probably about the same.[34]

By the armistice of Znaim,[35] more than a third part of the Austrian dominions remained in the occupation of the French, with a population of about eight and a half million souls. On these was levied a contribution of more than 196 million francs; and as the Poles of Galicia, comprising a population of about four millions, were exempted, this enormous sum was exacted from about four and a half million persons![36]

The conferences for a peace lasted three months. The Austrian Government purposely interposed delays, wishing to await the result of an English expedition against the coasts of Holland. Napoleon, on the other hand, alarmed at the state of the Peninsula, as anxiously pressed their termination, and threatened, if the negociations remained without effect, to adopt the most rigorous measures against the House of Austria, and especially to separate the three crowns. The PEACE OF SCHÖNBRUNN was at length signed, October 14th 1809.[37] By this treaty the Emperor Francis engaged to make various cessions to the Confederation of the Rhine, to Napoleon, to the King of Saxony, to the same monarch as Duke of Warsaw, and to the Emperor of Russia. The districts ceded

[34] Mailath, B. v. S. 311.
[35] Martens, *N. R.*, t. i. p. 309.
[36] Garden, t. xii. p. 91 sq.
[37] Martens, *Ibid.*, p. 217.

to the Rhenish Confederation comprised Salzburg, Berchtolsgaden, and part of Upper Austria, viz. the quarter of the Inn and half of the Hausrück.

The cessions made directly to Napoleon were the county of Görtz, or Goricia, and that of Montefalcone, forming the Austrian Friuli; the town and government of Trieste, Carniola, the circle of Villach in Carinthia, part of Croatia and Dalmatia, and the lordship of Räzuns in the Grison territory. All these provinces, with the exception of Räzuns, were incorporated by a decree of Napoleon, with Dalmatia and its islands, into a single state with the name of the *Illyrian Provinces.* They were never united with France, but always governed by Napoleon as an independent state. A few districts before possessed by Napoleon were also incorporated with them: as Venetian Istria and Dalmatia with the Bocca di Cattaro, Ragusa, and part of the Tyrol.

The cessions made to the King of Saxony, as such, consisted of only a few Bohemian villages; but, as Duke of Warsaw, were transferred to him all Western or New Galicia, with the circle of Zamosc in Eastern Galicia, including the town of Cràcow.

The cessions in favour of Russia comprised a district of Eastern or Old Galicia, but exclusive of the town of Brody, the only place which gave it any importance.

The only other articles of the treaty of much importance are the recognition by Austria of any changes made, or to be made, in Spain, Portugal, and Italy; the adherence of the Emperor to the prohibitive system adopted by France and Russia, and his engaging to cease all correspondence and relationship with Great Britain. By a decree made at Ratisbon, April 24th 1809, Napoleon had suppressed the Teutonic Order in all the States belonging to the Rhenish Confederation, reannexed its possessions to the domains of the prince in which they were situated, and incorporated Mergentheim, with the rights, domains, and revenues attached to the Grand Mastership of the Order, with the kingdom of Würtemberg. These dispositions were confirmed by the Treaty of Schönbrunn.

The effect aimed at by the Treaty of Schönbrunn was to surround Austria with powerful states, and thus to paralyse all her military efforts. On the south, by the cession of Carinthia, she lost the defiles which communicate with Italy and the Tyrol, and the means of defence offered by a natural frontier. On the west, by the loss of Salzburg and part of Austria, she was deprived of an excellent line of operations formed by the Inn in combination with the mountains of Bohemia, behind which she could

manœuvre in perfect safety. It was only on the north and the east, in which quarters she was not so much exposed to attack, that she preserved her natural boundaries. These cessions involved a loss of three and a half million subjects. The Emperor of Russia, on the other hand, was very ill satisfied with the small portion of the spoils assigned to him, and the augmentation awarded to the duchy of Warsaw. Hence the first occasion of coldness between him and Napoleon, whom he suspected of a design to re-establish the Kingdom of Poland.

After the armistice of Znaim, the Tyrol and Vorarlberg were evacuated by the Austrian troops; but the Tyrolese led by Hofer still continued the struggle. The Bavarians marched against them; forced the important position of Scharnitz October 25th, and on the 13th of November effected their junction with Eugène Beauharnais, who had entered the Tyrol by Villach. Hofer now announced his submission and directed the Tyrolese to separate. But the Bavarian general d'Erlm having proclaimed that every Tyrolese found with arms in his hand should be shot, and that every village where soldiers had been maltreated should be burnt, Hofer declared that he had been deceived and again called his countrymen to arms. But resistance now proved useless. The executions ordered by the French generals spread terror among the Tyrolese, and King Maximilian Joseph having offered a pardon, they a second time submitted. Hofer now concealed himself in a log hut in the mountains; but being either betrayed or discovered,[38] was carried to Mantua, tried before a court-martial, and shot (February 20th 1810).

Napoleon's life, during his residence at Schönbrunn, was threatened by an assassin. Frederick Staaps, a youth of eighteen, son of a Saxon Lutheran minister, laying wait for the Emperor at the daily parade of the troops in the court of the palace, endeavoured to approach him and to stab him with a long knife or dagger. When arrested and brought before Napoleon, Staaps avowed his purpose and assigned as his motive for it a desire for peace. He was shot on the 16th of October.

[38] The story commonly runs that he was betrayed for the sake of a reward of 300 ducats offered for his apprehension. The account, however, appears to rest on anything but a certain foundation. See Mailath, B. v. S. 314 Ann. The King of Bavaria solicited for Hofer's life, but Napoleon was inexorable.

CHAPTER XV.

We have alluded to a diversion which the Austrians expected in North Germany, as well as from an English expedition to the Scheldt. In both these quarters something was done, but not of a nature to be of any service to the Austrian cause.

A feeling of degradation, a desire to revenge their wrongs upon their French oppressors, had sprung up in Prussia and Northern Germany. In Prussia it was encouraged by the Baron von Stein, whom the King had placed at the head of the administration in 1807. Stein was the founder of the society called the *Tugendbund* or League of Virtue, which, consisting originally of a union of some literary and scientific men at Königsberg, ostensibly without any political object, soon became a rallying point for Prussian patriots. But the society hardly fulfilled the intentions of its founder. It became occupied with silly and pedantic objects of reform, and by adopting an inquisitorial system of *espionnage* towards those whom it chose to consider as unpatriotic, became more intolerable than the old Prussian *régime*.[1]

At the same time William, Duke of Brunswick Oels, third son of Duke Ferdinand, but, his elder brothers having renounced their rights, his destined successor, had conceived the project of bringing together a number of bold spirits who should undertake to re-establish him, as well as the Elector of Hesse-Cassel, in their dominions, to overthrow the Confederation of the Rhine, and expel the French from Germany. This society, formed by the Duke at Oels, his residence in Silesia, was joined by many Prussian officers, several of whom also belonged to the *Tugendbund*. When the Cabinet of Vienna was preparing for war it concluded a convention with Duke William, who engaged to raise at his own expense a corps of 2000 horse. Such was the origin of the famous *Black Brunswickers* or *Death's-head corps*, so called from their black uniform and the silver image of a skull worn in the cap of the troopers. The Duke, whose bravery and affability rendered him very popular, inspired his men with much of the courage and spirit of vengeance that animated himself.

[1] Menzel, Kap. xliv.

Before the Duke took the field, several attempts had been made by German partisans, some even before the Austrian war broke out, against the King of Westphalia. The most remarkable of these was the expedition of Major Schill, who had distinguished himself as a partisan in the previous war. Leaving Berlin with his regiment, Schill entered Halle, Halberstadt, and Dömitz, carrying off the military chests belonging to King Jerôme. Being pursued by a Dutch and Danish corps, as well as by the King of Westphalia's troops, Schill threw himself into Stralsund, and was mortally wounded in a battle in that town, May 31st 1809. Napoleon caused many of Schill's officers captured at Stralsund to be shot; the private soldiers were sent to the galleys at Toulon and Brest. The Duke of Brunswick took the field with his Black Brunswickers about the middle of May. He entered Dresden June 11th, where he was soon after joined by 10,000 Austrians commanded by General Am-Ende. The Duke penetrated to Leipsic, but was unable to maintain himself against the superior forces of King Jerôme. After the armistice of Znaim he cut his way through to the coast, and embarked with his legion of 1800 men on vessels furnished by an English squadron at Cuxhaven. The British Parliament assigned him a pension of 7000*l.*

Austria and the German patriots reckoned, as we have said, on a formidable expedition that was preparing in England, and which, had it been despatched to the Elbe or Weser, would no doubt have produced an electrical effect in Germany. But the views of the English Ministry were directed towards Antwerp and Flushing, which Napoleon was endeavouring to convert into great naval depôts. A fleet under Sir Richard Strachan, consisting of thirty-nine ships of the line, twenty-two frigates, a number of smaller vessels, and about two hundred transports, conveying an army of near 40,000 men, commanded by the Earl of Chatham, Pitt's elder brother, sailed from Portsmouth towards the end of July. Instead of striking the first blow at Antwerp, then comparatively disarmed, Earl Chatham spent a fortnight in besieging Flushing. This part of the enterprise succeeded. Flushing capitulated August 15th, and the Isles of Walcheren, South Beveland, and Schowen were occupied. But meanwhile, a large French army, under Bernadotte, had entered Antwerp, and the town was made so strong as to render any enterprise against it impracticable. The occupation of Walcheren, the only place retained, was deemed of no use after the Treaty of Schönbrunn, and as the English army suffered terribly from the fevers and agues which prevail in that island, it was re-embarked early in December. The partial destruction of

the fortifications, arsenal, and magazines of Flushing was the only result of an expedition said to have cost twenty millions.

The epoch of the Austrian war and humiliation of the Emperor was also marked by the deposition of the Pope. We have already described how, early in 1808, Pius VII. was made a prisoner in his own capital, and deprived of his provinces of Urbino, Ancona, and Macerata. Negociations were then entered into for his entire abdication, in return for which he was offered a considerable pension, and a residence at Avignon. To these offers Pius refused to listen, and on May 17th 1809 appeared an imperial decree from the camp at Vienna, uniting the Roman States to the French Empire, and declaring Rome a free and imperial city. In justification of this violence, Napoleon claimed the right, as the successor of Charlemagne, to recall the donation of that Emperor to the Holy See.[2] It might be idle to criticise the pretexts alleged for an arbitrary act of power; but it is obvious that Napoleon violated both history and law in confounding the empire of the Franks, a German people, with that of the French, and in questioning a title consecrated by a possession of ten centuries. The change of government was announced to the Roman citizens on June 10th, when the papal flag was struck on the castle of St. Angelo, and the French colours hoisted in its place, amidst a salute from the guns of the fortress. The new government, or *consulta*, issued a proclamation, promising that Rome should remain the seat of the visible head of the Church, that the Vatican, richly endowed, and elevated above all worldly interests, should present to the universe the spectacle of a purer and more splendid religion. But Pius VII. was by no means tempted with this prospect of his altered position. After having in vain protested against the sacrilege committed on his rights, he published, on June 11th 1809, the Bull *Quum memoranda*, excommunicating Napoleon and all his coadjutors engaged in the violences committed at Rome and in the States of the Church, since February 2nd 1808. After this misplaced act of vigour, Pius shut himself up in the Quirinal, surrounded by his Swiss guards. But he was soon to learn the real value of his obsolete spiritual weapons. On the night of July 4th the walls of his palace were escaladed by the *gendarmerie*, his apartments broken open, he himself seized, and conducted first to Grenoble, then to Savona. Here an order was issued, reducing his allowance to five *Pauls* (about two shillings) a day; but as the inhabitants of Savona vied with one another in sending him provisions, the order was revoked. An insolent letter was also addressed to him

[2] Montgaillard, t. vi. p. 400: Garden, t. xii. p. 160.

by the Prefect of the Department, July 11th 1811, in which he was told that, "as nothing could make him wise, he would see that the Emperor was powerful enough, like his predecessors, to depose a Pope." As he still remained intractable, and as it was feared that he might be carried off by the English cruisers from Savona, he was brought, in the month of June 1812, to Fontainebleau, and retained there in captivity. Napoleon's decree from Vienna was confirmed by a *senatus-consulte* of February 17th 1810, providing for the government of the States of the Church. Rome was declared the second city of the empire; it was to give the title of King to the Prince Imperial, and the future Emperors of the French, after their coronation in Nôtre Dame, were also to be crowned in St. Peter's at Rome, before the tenth year of their reign.

By a decree of March 3rd 1809, Napoleon bestowed the Grand Duchy of Tuscany on his sister, Eliza Bacciocchi, already the sovereign of Lucca and Piombino. Endued with a superior mind, the mild and beneficent government of this princess, and her patronage of art and literature, made her beloved by her subjects. In southern Italy, King Joachim of Naples (Murat), soon after his accesssion, succeeded in driving Sir Hudson Lowe and the English from the Isle of Capri, which they had occupied (October 1808). In 1809 Sir John Stuart got possession of Ischia and Procida, and an English squadron appeared before Naples; but the citizens, mindful of what they had suffered in 1799, rallied round King Joachim, and rendered the success of a descent too hopeless to be attempted. In the same year, Murat made great preparations for the conquest of Sicily, and assembled a large force in the neighbourhood of Reggio. General Cavaignac's division actually landed between Messina and La Scaletta; but not being supported by the rest of the army, was exterminated (September 18th). In order to bring the affairs of this part of the world under one point of view, we shall here mention the revolution effected in Sicily by Lord William Bentinck in 1811. Queen Caroline opposed the British influence in this island; and after the death of Acton, who had conciliated matters between her and the English, the Queen became more violent. The Sicilian barons having declared for the English, four of them were arrested by order of King Ferdinand; and the Court required that the British troops should evacuate the island. But Lord Bentinck caused fifteen individuals to be arrested, accused of plotting to betray Sicily and the English army. This act of vigour disabled the Court party. Ferdinand resigned the government in favour of his son; Lord Bentinck was proclaimed Generalissimo of the Sicilian troops, and a Parliament

assembled in July 1812, decreed a constitution modelled on that of Great Britain. Queen Caroline, who was accused of having entered into correspondence with Napoleon, was compelled to fly the island. But to return to the narrative.

After the Peace of Schönbrunn, which seemed to have consolidated his power, Napoleon resolved to strengthen and perpetuate his dynasty by a marriage with the daughter of some royal house. He no longer entertained the hope of having any issue by Josephine, and on this ground he ordained the dissolution of his marriage with her. His proposals for the hand of a Russian grand duchess were coldly received; and his choice then wavered between a daughter of the King of Saxony and an Austrian archduchess. He at length decided for the latter, and his overtures being accepted by the Emperor Francis, Napoleon was affianced to his daughter, the Archduchess Maria Louisa, February 7th 1810. The marriage was celebrated at Vienna March 9th, by procuration, on which occasion the Archduke Charles, the uncle of the bride, represented the French Emperor. Maria Louisa arrived at Compiègne on the 28th. The nuptials, though brilliant, yet somewhat sad, were celebrated at St. Cloud, April 1st. Not a single member of the Austrian family had accompanied Maria Louisa to Paris! She seemed a victim of political necessity, rather than a bride.

At this period the affairs of Spain and Holland became the chief objects of Napoleon's attention.

Holland, like Spain, groaned under the weight of the French alliance. She had been obliged to support a numerous French army, to provide a large fleet for the service of France, and to enter into a war with England, by which she had gradually lost all her colonies and all her trade. Since the entry of the French into Holland in 1795, the public debt, already large, had been increased by nearly half. Agriculture, commerce, manufactures, were almost destroyed, and universal distress prevailed. After thus ruining Holland, Napoleon imposed upon it a King, hoping to find in his brother Louis an instrument that would blindly execute all his orders. But in this he was deceived. Compelled to wear a crown which he had not sought, Louis identified his interests with those of the nation which he was called to govern. To put an end to this state of things, and reduce Louis to subjection, Napoleon, after the Peace of Schönbrunn, invited him to Paris, where he arrived December 1st 1809. Some stormy interviews took place between the brothers, and as Louis maintained with firmness the interests of his subjects, Napoleon announced a project of annexing to France a considerable part of Holland,

which was described as a mere alluvion of French rivers, the Rhine, the Meuse, and the Scheldt, and consequently by right a portion of France. Louis, seeing what turn affairs were taking, now made some attempts to return to Holland, but found himself closely watched and guarded. On the 20th January 1810 appeared a decree for the military occupation of all the country between the Meuse, the Scheldt, and the ocean, and placing the towns in it in a state of siege. The threatened annexation of Holland was made an occasion to attempt a negociation with England, as it was thought that the apprehension of so great an addition to the strength of France would induce the English Ministry to conclude a peace. M. Labouchère, of the house of Hope and Co., was despatched to London; but the Cabinet of St. James's, despairing probably of the independence of Holland so long as Napoleon should remain master of France, declined to enter into any conferences. Louis was compelled to sign a treaty, or rather capitulation, at Paris, March 16th 1810, by the sixth article of which, "according to the constitutional principle in France, that the valley of the Rhine is the limit of the French empire," the King of Holland ceded to the Emperor of the French Dutch Brabant, all Zealand, with the Isle of Schowen, and the part of Guelderland on the left bank of the Waal.[3] Louis ratified the treaty as it was dictated to him, after some vain attempts to obtain juster terms, adding however the salvo, "so far as shall be possible." So much did Napoleon consider himself master of Holland, that he arrogated the right of granting to the Dutch licenses to trade with England. The manufactures of that country were strictly prohibited, and French troops mixed with Dutch and accompanied by French custom-house officers were to be stationed at the mouths of all the rivers to watch over the maintenance of these commercial regulations.

King Louis returned into Holland at the beginning of April; but it was evident that he could no longer preserve even the shadow of independence. The English expedition to Zealand, and the so-called treaty of March 16th, served as pretences for introducing a large body of French troops into the kingdom. On the 20th of May 1810, Napoleon addressed from Ostend a threatening letter to his brother, in which he harshly explained to him the situation which he occupied. "All the world," he says, "knows that without me you are nothing. If your knowledge of my character, which is, to march straight to my object, without suffering any consideration to arrest me, has not opened your eyes,

[3] Garden, t. xii. p. 246.

how can I help it? Having the navigation of the Meuse and the Rhine down to their mouths I can do without Holland, but Holland cannot do without my protection." He then goes on to tell Louis that if he had behaved as he ought, the throne of Holland would have been but a pedestal, to have been subseqently extended to Hamburg, Osnabrück and part of the North of Germany.

It was evident after this letter that all hope of conciliation was at an end. The Dutch laws, the national uniform, cockade and flag were set at nought and insulted by the French military authorities, and towards the end of June the French insisted on occupying Amsterdam, though a solemn assurance to the contrary had been given only a little before. Louis at first thought of defending his capital, but as he was not supported in this project by the chief civil and military authorities, there was no alternative but to resign his crown. On the 1st of July 1810, he signed at Haarlem his act of abdication, in favour of his eldest son Napoleon Louis, and in his default, of his second son Charles Louis Napoleon.[4] Louis immediately set off for the baths of Töplitz in Bohemia. His sons were brought to Paris and lodged in a pavilion in the park of St. Cloud. Addressing the eldest of these princes who was only six years of age, Napoleon is said to have exhorted him never to forget, in whatever situation he might be placed, that his first duties were towards him, the Emperor, the second towards France; all his other duties, even those of the people who were confided to him, came after.[5] Napoleon, however, had no intention of leaving to his nephew the crown of Holland. That country was annexed to France by a decree of July 10th. Amsterdam was declared the third city of the Empire. All naval and military officers were retained in their posts. Colonial merchandise actually in Holland might be retained by the proprietors on paying an *ad valorem* duty of fifty per cent. The Duke of Piacenza, as Napoleon's lieutenant-general, was to assume at Amsterdam the administration of affairs till January 1st 1811, when a French government was to be formed.

The ex-King Louis insisted on residing as a private individual in the Austrian dominions, although Napoleon made several attempts to induce him to settle in France, or in some state governed by a member of the Bonaparte family. He fixed his residence first at Marburg, on the borders of Carinthia and Styria, and finally at Gratz, the capital of the latter province, carrying

[4] The present Emperor of the French, then two years of age.
[5] Garden, t. xii. p. 273.

into his retirement the love of his people and the esteem of Europe.[6]

It was not till December 10th 1810 that Holland was united to France by a formal *senatus-consulte*. By the first article of the same law, the Hanse Towns, the Duchy of Lauenburg, and the countries situated between the North Sea and a line drawn from the confluence of the Lippe with the Rhine to Halteren, from Halteren to the Ems above Telgte, from the Ems to the confluence of the Werra with the Weser, and from Stolzenau on that river to the Elbe, above the confluence of the Stecknitz, were at the same time incorporated with the French Empire.[7] The Duke of Oldenburg having appealed to the Emperor of Russia, the head of his house, against this spoliation, Napoleon offered to compensate him with the town and territory of Erfurt and the lordship of Blankenheim, which had remained under French administration since the Peace of Tilsit. But this offer was at once rejected, and Alexander reserved, by a formal protest, the rights of his relative. This annexation was only the complement of other incorporations with the French Empire during the year 1810. Early in the year, the Electorate of Hanover had been annexed to the Kingdom of Westphalia. On February 16th Napoleon had erected the Grand Duchy of Frankfort, and presented it to the Prince Primate of the Confederation of the Rhine, with a reversal in favour of Eugène Beauharnais. On November 12th the Valais in Switzerland was also annexed to France, with the view of securing the road over the Simplon. Of all these annexations, that of the Hanse Towns and the districts on the North Sea was the most important, and one of the principal causes of the war that ensued between France and Russia. These annexations were made without the slightest negociation with any European cabinet, and it would be superfluous to add, without even a pretext of right; though the necessity of them from the war with England was alleged as the motive. By means of a canal from Lübeck to Hamburg, thence to the Weser, and from the Weser to the Ems, Napoleon proposed ultimately to connect the Baltic with the Seine.

The Peace of Schönbrunn enabled Napoleon to devote all his efforts to the subjugation of Spain. The affairs of the Peninsula have been brought down to the retreat of Sir John Moore and the

[6] The affairs of Holland at this period have been described by King Louis himself, in his *Documents Hist. sur le Gouvernement de la Hollande.*

[7] Garden, t. xiii. p. 159 sq. The line described would include the northern part of Westphalia and Hanover, and the duchy of Oldenburg.

departure of Napoleon early in 1809. The French were then in the following positions: Gouvion St. Cyr was established in Catalonia. Lannes had been engaged, since the end of December, in the second siege of Saragossa, and was afterwards to reduce Aragon; Marshal Bessières occupied Old Castile, securing the communications with France; Marshal Lefèbvre was to operate in La Mancha; Marshal Victor, after manœuvring on the frontiers of Estremadura, with the view of supporting Marshal Soult in the reduction of Portugal, was to march upon Andalusia, while Marshal Ney was to undertake the conquest of Galicia. Each Marshal acted independently, obeying only the commands of Napoleon, who was afraid to trust any of his lieutenants with the supreme direction of affairs, and deemed his brother Joseph not competent to that office. Joseph had, however, returned to Madrid, January 22nd 1809. Saragossa surrendered February 20th, after an heroic defence, which might recal the sieges of Numantia or Saguntum. Every street, almost every house, had been warmly contested; the monks, and even the women, had taken a conspicuous share in the defence; more than 40,000 bodies of each sex and every age testified the obstinate courage of the besieged.

Soult, after the battle of Corunna, entered Portugal, occupied Oporto at the end of March, and prepared to march upon Lisbon. Victor had defeated the Spanish general Cuesta at Medellin, March 28th. In spite of this defeat, however, Cuesta again raised his army, by reinforcements, to near 40,000 men, and proceeded to form a junction with the English and Portuguese under Sir Arthur Wellesley. That commander had landed at Oporto, April 22nd, with considerable reinforcements, which, with the Portuguese under Lord Beresford, brought up the army to more than 25,000 men. A decree of the Prince Regent, December 11th 1808, had ordered all the men of Portugal from the age of fifteen to sixty to take arms, on pain of being shot. Twenty-four Portuguese regiments were taken into English pay, and Lord Beresford was appointed by the Regent field-marshal of all the Portuguese troops. In 1809 Portugal obtained from England a subsidy of 600,000*l.*

Sir Arthur Wellesley immediately advanced against Soult, whom he speedily compelled to evacuate Portugal, and to seek repose under the walls of Lugo. Wellesley then entered Spain, and formed a junction with Cuesta at Oropesa. The British general's army now numbered about 60,000 men, and it was determined to march upon Madrid. King Joseph advanced to meet him, accompanied by Marshals Victor and Jourdan, who in reality commanded the French army. The hostile forces met at Talavera de la Reyna,

seventy or eighty miles south-west of Madrid, July 27th. Here an obstinate battle took place on that and the following day, in which the French were defeated and compelled to retreat over the Alberche with the loss of 10,000 men and 20 guns. Jourdan, indeed, with the usual French *fanfaronade*, claimed the victory in his official despatch, which, however, was dated from Toledo, showing a retrograde march of sixty miles! For this victory Sir Arthur was rewarded with the title of Viscount Wellington of Talavera. But he was not in a condition to pursue his success. Provisions began to fail; Soult, Ney, and Mortier were advancing from the north, he did not repose much confidence in his Spanish allies, and he therefore deemed it prudent to fall back upon Badajoz.

During this period the Spanish general, Blake, who commanded the armies of Aragon and Valencia, made an attempt to recover Saragossa. But he was completely defeated by Suchet at Belchite, June 18th, and compelled to evacuate Aragon. During Wellington's advance upon Madrid, the army of La Mancha, under Venegas, was also marching upon that capital, which it had reached within a few miles. But the retrograde movement of the British compelled Venegas also to retreat. He was overtaken and defeated by Sebastiani at Almonacid, August 11th, and driven in disorder into the defiles of the Sierra Morena. The news of the armistice of Znaim induced Wellington to cast his eyes on the celebrated position of Torres Vedras, near Lisbon. As he neither approved the plans of the Central Junta, nor received from it the aid which he required, he determined henceforth to undertake no enterprise in conjunction with the Spanish armies. The Spaniards, not discouraged by this determination, continued their operations. The Duke del Parque obtained possession of Salamanca October 25th. The Junta had succeeded in assembling in La Mancha an army of more than 50,000 men, with 55 guns, which was directed on the capital by way of Toledo. But its commander, Areizaga, who had neither talents nor experience, was completely beaten by Soult at Ocaña, November 19th, with a loss of 5000 men, and compelled to abandon all his artillery, colours, baggage, and 30,000 prisoners. This was the last pitched battle fought by the Spaniards. The year was concluded by the capture of Gerona by the French, December 10th. The defence of this place, the rampart of Catalonia, by Alvarez, may be paralleled with that of Saragossa by Palafox. After enduring a siege of half a year, and repulsing numerous assaults, it yielded at length only to famine, after a vain attempt to relieve it by Blake.

In 1810, Napoleon, released from every other continental war, employed all his efforts for the reduction of Spain. All the nations subjected to his influence were obliged to furnish their contingents for this purpose, and besides the flower of the French troops, many Swiss, Italian, Neapolitan, Polish, and German regiments contributed to enrich with their blood the soil of the Peninsula. The number of troops thus united amounted to near 370,000, of which about 280,000 were able to take the field. An expedition into Portugal was to form the main object of the campaign. But before this could be prepared, King Joseph resolved to attempt the conquest of the southern provinces of Spain. Here lay the chief power of the Spanish insurrection. From Andalusia were drawn the principal resources for the war; the central Junta sat at Seville, and the Cortès had been convoked in that city early in March. Joseph started on this expedition, with 50,000 men; Mortier, Victor, Dessoles, and Sebastian served as his lieutenants. To oppose this force the Spaniards had only 25,000 men under Areizaga, and 12,000 under the Duke of Albuquerque. The army of Areizaga was soon dispersed. Joseph entered Cordova January 27th, Seville February 1st. Sebastiani occupied Granada January 29th; early in February he had penetrated to Malaga. Soult also crossed the Sierra Morena and laid siege to Cadiz, which town was defended by a garrison of 22,000 English, Spanish, and Portuguese, under the command of General Graham. Albuquerque had thrown himself into it with his little army, and after the capture of Seville, Cadiz became the seat of the Spanish Government. Soult ultimately relinquished the conduct of the siege to Victor. The French lines extended from Rota to Chiclana, thus including the two bays of Cadiz, the Isle of Leon, and an adjacent isle in which the city is built.

Wellington having now prepared the lines of Torres Vedras, obtained in January 1810 the consent of the English Government to defend them to the last; but at the same time he made arrangements with Admiral Berkeley for evacuating the Peninsula in case of need. The outermost of these celebrated lines, which were three in number, ran from the sea by Torres Vedras to Alhandra on the Tagus, where the river is no longer fordable. Thus the peninsula on which Lisbon stands was completely enclosed, while to the north the whole country was laid waste as far as the river Mondego; the roads, bridges, mills, crops, were destroyed, so as to deprive an invading army of the means of subsistence. Each of the three lines was protected with numerous forts and redouts, and bristled altogether with near 400 pieces of artillery. Welling-

ton's retreat to these lines from a position which he had taken up on the Coa, in the province of Beira, had been secured by fortifying all the positions both on the road along the Tagus by Abrantès, and that on the sea-coast by Coimbra; both of which unite at the defile of Santarem.

Masséna took the command of the French army at Salamanca towards the end of May, to make a third attempt at the conquest of Portugal. His army consisted of 70,000 veteran troops, and a reserve of about 18,000 at Valladolid under Drouet. Wellington had about 24,000 British troops and 50,000 Portuguese, but part of this force had been detached beyond the Tagus to observe Soult. Masséna began the campaign by the siege of Ciudad Rodrigo, June 25th, which capitulated July 12th. It formed part of Wellington's plans not to quit his position in order to relieve this city. Almeida was next attacked, when the explosion of the principal powder-magazine, August 27th, having destroyed great part of the city and ramparts and many of the garrison, compelled the commandant to surrender. Wellington now retreated by the valley of the Mondego, defending one position after another, and destroying at each attack a great many of the French. In October Wellington entered the impregnable lines of Torres Vedras. After seeking in vain for a vulnerable point, Masséna took up a position between Santarem and Alcanede towards the middle of November. Here he remained with little alteration several months, till at last the absolute want of provisions compelled him to retreat, March 1st 1811. He was pursued by Wellington, who on the 7th of April invested Almeida. To relieve this place Masséna delivered two battles at Fuentes de Onoro, May 3rd and 5th, in which he was defeated. The French then evacuated Almeida.

General Graham having made an attempt to raise the blockade of Cadiz, Soult quitted Estremadura to march to Victor's assistance. But Beresford and Castaños having taken advantage of this movement to cross the Guadiana, invest Badajoz, and march upon Seville, Soult retraced his steps, and gave them battle at Albuhera, May 16th. Victory, though not very decisive, remained on the whole in favour of Beresford. Soult abandoned the field of battle and retreated southwards. Wellington, leaving Sir B. Spencer and Crawford to watch the French army under Marmont, by whom Masséna had been superseded, came to superintend in person the siege of Badajoz. But Soult, with reinforcements, having again advanced from the Sierra Morena and formed a junction with Marmont at Merida, Wellington raised the siege and retired to Portalegre in the Alenteijo. Hence he

subsequently crossed the Tagus, and during the remainder of the year remained on the defensive. Suchet, commander of the French division on the Ebro, made several important conquests in the course of 1811. Tortosa surrendered to him January 2nd, Tarragona on the 28th of June, after a seven weeks' siege, which, for the obstinacy of the defence, might almost vie with those of Saragossa and Gerona. This victory procured for Suchet the *bâton* of marshal. Suchet, after taking Montserrat by assault, July 25th, applied himself to the reduction of the Kingdom of Valencia. The central Junta, now sitting at Cadiz, intrusted the defence of this province to General Blake. Such was the rabid hatred which that general entertained for the English, that he refused to receive any assistance from them, except arms and ammunition. This conduct was no doubt absurd enough; at the same time, we should reflect that this bigoted patriotism and detestation of foreigners were the real causes of the Spanish insurrection. Suchet entered Valencia in the middle of September, and laid siege to Murviedro, the ancient Saguntum. Blake, who made an attempt to relieve the place, was defeated by Suchet, October 25th, and compelled to retire into the town of Valencia. Murviedro surrendered two days after. Suchet then besieged Blake in Valencia, who was reduced to capitulate, January 9th 1812.[8]

Wellington began the campaign of 1812 by suddenly passing the Agueda, surprising in the night of January 9th some of the outworks of Ciudad Rodrigo, and taking that town on the 19th. Then, after leaving a Spanish garrison in the town, he retreated into Portugal. In March he resumed the offensive; Badajoz was taken by assault, after a siege of three weeks, April 6th. Wellington then advanced to the Tormès. He appeared before Salamanca on the 16th of June, which place surrendered on the 28th. The French now retired awhile behind the Douro, but recrossed that river about the middle of July, and gave Wellington battle in the environs of Salamanca on the 22nd. In this engagement Marmont was wounded and completely defeated. The consequences of Wellington's victory were highly important. The French were compelled to evacuate New Castile and Andalusia, thus raising the lengthened blockade of Cadiz, and leaving behind them their artillery. Soult, with the army of Andalusia, was ordered to form a junction with King Joseph, who was preparing

[8] Suchet, who, in reward for his victories, was created Duke of Albufera, has written an account of the French campaigns in Spain: *Mém. du Maréchal Suchet sur les Campagnes en Espagne depuis* 1808 *jusqu'en* 1814.

to retire to Valencia. The absurd and obstinate pride of the General Ballasteros, who refused to co-operate with the British, is said to have prevented Wellington from intercepting Soult's northward march. After its defeat at Salamanca, Marmont's army, now commanded by Clauset, fled precipitately to Valladolid. Wellington now marched upon Madrid, which he entered August 12th. The French garrison in the Retiro surrendered on the 14th, when 180 guns and a large quantity of arms and ammunition were captured; Wellington was named by the Cortès generalissimo of all the Spanish armies September 25th. But as it was impossible to hold a large and open town like Madrid, in face of the French armies, which surrounded it on all sides, Wellington retired to Salamanca, and thence took up his winter quarters at Ciudad Rodrigo. The French re-entered Madrid in November.

Thus, on the whole, the "Spanish ulcer" was fast eating into Napoleon's power. And now was to be added to it a war with Russia, which gave the first impulse to his downfall. At this period of the fullest development of his empire, the countries over which he ruled, either immediately or by his viceroys and tributary princes, were France with the annexations of Holland, the Hanse Towns, the Duchy of Oldenburg, the Valais, &c., containing a population computed at 42,000,000 souls; Italy, including Naples, &c., 10,600,000; the Illyrian provinces, 1,000,000; the Confederation of the Rhine, 11,000,000; the Kingdom of Westphalia, 2,100,000; the Duchy of Warsaw, 3,600,000; Switzerland, 1,600,000; forming a total of near 72,000,000 souls. Truly we know not whether the most to admire that a simple lieutenant of artillery should have made himself Emperor of France, or that an Emperor of France should in so brief a period have more than doubled the number of his subjects.

But these successes, so far from satisfying, had only whetted his ambition. He aspired to be the master of the world. On his return from Holland in 1810, he had been heard to exclaim, that in five years he should attain that object. Russia was the only obstacle, but Russia should be crushed. Paris should extend to St. Cloud. He would build fifteen ships every year, but launch none till he had 150. Then he should be master of the sea as well as the land; he would monopolise all commerce, and would receive only so much as he exported—million for million—a splendid dream! but forcibly recalling the reverie of the glass-dealer in the Eastern tale. Russia, the only Power that could impede these projects, became by that circumstance alone his principal enemy; while the refusal of the hand of the Grandduchess Anne piqued

his pride, and stimulated to revenge. His marriage with Maria Louisa entitled him to reckon on Austria, and from that event must be dated his schemes against Russia.

It did not long escape the penetration of the Emperor Alexander, that Napoleon had begun to regard the alliance of Tilsit as a dead letter. The Czar had several well-grounded causes of complaint. The establishment of the Duchy of Warsaw, especially after its aggrandisement by the Treaty of Schönbrunn, was a standing menace. The privation of English commerce had inflicted a severe blow upon the prosperity of Russia. The annexation of Oldenburg to the French Empire was felt by Alexander as an insult and injury to his family. But all these minor grievances sunk into insignificance in comparison of the great question whether Napoleon was to be the absolute dictator of Europe. Napoleon on his side complained that the Emperor of Russia, contrary to the faith of treaties, had been of no service to him whatever in his war with Austria; that, instead of marching 150,000 men, as it was in his power, to second the French army, he had only sent 15,000, and even these so late that the war had been decided before they crossed the frontier.[9] The French Emperor's intentions could not be doubtful, and were, indeed, hardly concealed. What could be the object of the continued occupation of the Prussian fortresses, the concentration of French troops between the Oder and the Vistula, the accumulation of military stores at Dantzic? Nay, in establishing himself at Lübeck, Napoleon had openly proclaimed his intention of converting it into a great maritime arsenal; from which it could only be inferred that it was designed to command the Baltic. Regarding, therefore, a rupture with France as inevitable, and perhaps not far distant, Alexander began silently to prepare the means of resistance.

Alarmed at the additions made to the Duchy of Warsaw by the Treaty of Schönbrunn, Alexander had procured, January 5th 1810, the signature of the French ambassador at St. Petersburg to a Convention, stipulating, that the Kingdom of Poland should never be re-established, that the names of Poland and the Poles should be used in no public act, and that no part of the ancient Kingdom of Poland should be annexed to the Duchy of Warsaw.[10] This act Napoleon refused to ratify on the pretext that it was incompatible with his dignity; though he offered to sign a different and much less explicit engagement. Alexander considered this refusal as the first positive indication of Napoleon's altered views. Before the

[9] *Report* of the Duke of Bassano to the French Emperor June 20th 1812, ap. Garden, t. xiii. p. 242.

[10] *Ibid.* p. 176.

end of the year (December 31st 1810) appeared a ukase for a new tariff of customs, by which French goods were either prohibited or charged with higher duties, while colonial merchandise was permitted to enter under a neutral flag.[11] In other words, Russia renounced the Continental System, and consequently the intimate alliance with Napoleon of which it was the pledge. The ukase was also made a political measure by organising, for the enforcement of these measures, an army of 90,000 men, under the name of *frontier guards*, commanded by officers of the regular army. Napoleon complained bitterly of this proceeding, and made it the pretext for a new conscription. Besides this measure, the arming of the Poles of the Duchy of Warsaw, and the gradual reinforcement of the French army in Germany, whose headquarters were transferred from Ratisbon to Hamburg, gave unequivocal proof of the French Emperor's hostile disposition. Alexander, to obviate the consequences, directed the greater part of his military forces towards the western frontiers of his empire. Napoleon, however, embarrassed by the affairs of Spain, was not yet prepared to strike the meditated blow. He found it prudent to dissemble for the present, and the year 1811 was spent in negociations.

In connection with a war between France and Russia, the disposition of Turkey and Sweden was of the highest importance. Russia was at this time engaged in a war with the Porte. It will be recollected that in the conferences at Erfurt in the autumn of 1808, Napoleon had conceded to Alexander the annexation of Moldavia and Wallachia. Immediately on his return to St. Petersburg, the Czar directed that the Porte should be informed of this arrangement, and a congress was assembled at Jassy to carry it into execution. But when the Russian plenipotentiaries required, as preliminary bases, the cession of the two provinces and the expulsion of the English ambassador from Constantinople, the Porte at once broke off the conferences, and hostilities immediately ensued. We cannot enter into the details of this war, which began in February 1809, and lasted three or four years. The chief operation of the campaign of 1809 was the capture of Ismail by the Russians, September 26th, who were at first commanded by Posoroffski and then by Prince Bagration. A bloody battle at Tartaritza, November 3rd, remained undecided. In 1810, Kamenskoï II., who had succeeded Bagration, captured Silistria, June 23rd. He then assaulted the entrenched camp of the Vizier, Yusuf Pasha, on the heights of Shumla, July 5th and 6th, without success. The

[11] Garden, t. xiii. p. 178 sq.

Russians were also repulsed with great loss in an attack upon Rustchuk, defended by Ali Pasha and Boznak Aga, August 16th. But on September 19th, the Turks under Achmet Pasha were signally defeated at Batyne; a victory which put the Russians in possession of Sistova and the Turkish flotilla at that place. Gladova, Rustchuk, Ghiurgevo, Widdin, Nikopolis, Turna, now surrendered in quick succession. At the end of the year the Russians found themselves masters of the right bank of the Danube; but the Grand Vizier still held out in his formidable camp at Shumla. A great many places in Servia were also wrested from the Turks by the insurgents of that province, assisted by a Russian force. The Turks were discouraged; a congress assembled at Bucharest, and everything seemed to promise a speedy peace, when, by a sudden revolution, Yussuf Pasha was superseded, and the command given to Achmet Aga, an active and enterprising general. Under his auspices, the Turkish cause revived. At this time the Russian army, apparently in the confident anticipation of a peace with the Porte through the mediation of England, had been weakened by the removal of five divisions to the frontiers of the Duchy of Warsaw in anticipation of the French war; from the same cause the Turkish artillery was now directed by French officers, and did formidable execution. Kutusoff, who had succeeded Kamenskoï in command of the Russians, was compelled to abandon all his posts on the left bank of the Danube, and Achmet Aga crossed that river and carried the war into Wallachia. But this advance proved his destruction. General Markoff, crossing the Danube above Rustchuk, surprised the Turkish reserve before that place and compelled it to enter the town. The army of Achmet was thus cut off, and, as a Russian flotilla had gained the command of the river, it was compelled to capitulate to Kutusoff December 20th. The Porte now sued for peace; a congress was opened at Bucharest, and a treaty was signed at that place May 28th 1812, in spite of all Napoleon's attempts to dissuade the Sultan from entering into it. The Pruth was now to form the boundary between the two empires; an arrangement by which the Porte abandoned all Bessarabia with Ismail and Kilia, and about a third part of Moldavia, with the fortresses of Chotzim and Bender.[12] But the impending hostilities between France and Russia had probably saved Turkey from dismemberment, or, at all events, from the loss of all Moldavia and Wallachia. An armistice was granted to the Servians.

Both emperors had courted the aid of Sweden in the approaching

[12] Koch et Schöll, *Traités*, t. xiv. p. 539 sq.

struggle; Napoleon by compulsion and threats, Alexander by representations and promises. A sort of revolution had taken place in that country.* Charles XIII. having no issue, nor hopes of any, the Swedes had, in August 1809, elected as their Crown Prince Christian Augustus of Schleswig-Holstein-Augustenburg, the nearest relative of the King of Denmark. The choice was popular with the greater part of the nation. Christian Augustus was received with enthusiasm on his arrival in Sweden in January 1810, except by the higher aristocracy, and especially the families of Piper and Fersen. But he enjoyed his new dignity only a few months. At a review held in Schonen, May 23rd, he fell from his horse and suddenly expired. He had been unwell a little previously after partaking of a pasty. Popular suspicion was directed against Count Fersen[13] and his sister the Countess Piper, of having poisoned him, and on the funeral day of the Crown Prince, the Count was maltreated and murdered by the mob, the palace of his sister stormed and sacked. It now became necessary to elect another successor to the crown. Frederick VI., King of Denmark, who had succeeded to that throne on the death of Christian VII. in March 1808, became a candidate for that of Sweden. But the Swedes had turned their views on Marshal Bernadotte, Prince of Ponte Corvo, who had acquired the esteem of the Swedes during his administration of Hanover and the Hanse Towns, as well as the affection of Count Mörner and other Swedish officers, by his conduct after capturing them at Travemünde in 1806. Mörner, who had great influence among the elective nobility, took up the cause of Bernadotte, whose name had been already mentioned at the time of the first vacancy. Bernadotte had also acquired other partisans among the Swedish nobles at the time when he commanded in North Germany and Jutland. Mörner sent his nephew to Paris, with an offer to Bernadotte to support his election, on condition that he should abandon his French citizenship and openly adopt the Lutheran Confession. The offer was accepted, subject to the approbation of Napoleon, which was accorded; and on the 25th of August 1810, Charles John Bernadotte was unanimously elected Crown Prince of Sweden by the four orders of the States assembled at Orebro. Whatever were Napoleon's private feelings on this occasion, he behaved towards his former marshal in the handsomest manner. He absolved Bernadotte from his allegiance, presented him with two million francs in ready money,

[13] The same who had been so active in aiding Louis XVI.'s flight to Varennes. The causes of the Crown Prince's death were not accurately investigated, and the subject still remains a mystery.

appointed a splendid suite to accompany him into Sweden, defrayed the expenses of his inauguration, and allowed him to retain the possessions which he had purchased in France. The new Crown Prince arrived in Sweden in October 1810. He was immediately adopted by Charles XIII. as his son, appointed generalissimo of the forces, and initiated in all the affairs of state, in which he henceforth took a leading part.[14]

We have already related that Sweden, as the price of peace with France, had been compelled to accede to the Continental System by the Treaty of Paris, January 6th 1810. But this engagement was eluded by an active contraband trade, which was extremely facilitated by the conformation of the Swedish coasts. Hence violent remonstrances on the part of Napoleon, who accused the Swedish Government of conniving at this evasion of the treaty, and becoming a useful ally of England. In November 1810, the French Minister at Stockholm demanded that Sweden should declare war against England, should cause all English vessels in her ports to be seized, all English and colonial goods to be confiscated, under whatever flag imported. If these demands were not accorded in five days, the French ambassador was immediately to take his departure. Charles XIII. had no alternative, and declared war against Great Britain November 17th 1810; a step, however, which that country seemed to ignore. Napoleon, having thus, as he imagined, compromised Sweden, began to develope his further plans. Though he had implicated that country in a maritime war with the English, he demanded 6000 Swedish sailors to complete the crews of his fleet at Brest; a requisition which Charles XIII. refused by pleading the constitutional laws of his kingdom. The French Government then required the adoption of the tariff of Trianon in Sweden, and the establishment at Gothenburg of a French custom-house staff. Presently Napoleon began to develope his project against Russia by demanding the formation of a Northern Confederation, on the plan of that of the Rhine, to be composed of Denmark, Sweden, and the Duchy of Warsaw, under himself as Protector. As this proposal was not accepted, it was altered for an intimate and particular alliance with France. But Napoleon, perceiving that he could not rely on the friendship of a Power which he had placed in a position contrary to its interests, began to change his tone and conduct.

[14] Respecting Bernadotte as Crown Prince and King of Sweden, see Mörner, *Wahl des Prinzen von Ponte Corvo*; Meredith, *Memorials of Charles John, King of Sweden and Norway*; Coupé de St. Donat et B. de Roquefort, *Mém. pour servir à l'Hist. de Charles XIV. Jean, Roi de Suède et de Norvège.*

French privateers were allowed to capture Swedish vessels, on pretence that they were not provided with licenses. Presently they began to attack Swedish coasters in the Sound, laden with the produce or manufactures of Sweden, on the allegation that their cargoes were destined for Great Britain. Napoleon also caused all Swedish ships in German harbours to be seized, treated their crews as prisoners of war, placed them in irons, and despatched them to serve in the French fleets at Antwerp and Toulon.

These hostile measures were rendered still more insupportable by the haughty and overbearing tone adopted by M. Alquier, the French ambassador. At length the seal was put to them by the seizure of Pomerania. Marshal Davoust, Prince d'Eckmühl, who ruled in North Germany with a rod of iron, and whose zeal, perhaps, was further stimulated by the personal enmity which he felt for Bernadotte, despatched, in January 1812, General Friant, with 15,000 or 20,000 men into Pomerania. The general, who was accompanied by a whole legion of custom-house officers, announced himself as a friend, and the Swedish governor of the province, who had only a few thousand men at his disposal, could make no resistance. No sooner had the French troops entered, than all the Swedish officers employed in the public service were carried off and imprisoned at Hamburg, and their posts filled up with Frenchmen. Enormous contributions were imposed upon the inhabitants, all Swedish vessels were seized and armed as privateers. At the beginning of March, the Swedish troops, which till then had acted with the French, were disarmed, and sent into France as prisoners of war.

Bernadotte, as Crown Prince, had sincerely embraced the interests of his adoptive country. There is reason to believe that before the end of 1810, and consequently only a few months after his arrival in Sweden, he had come to an understanding with the Russian Emperor with regard to an alliance against France. At that period, as we have seen, Alexander had virtually annulled the Treaty of Tilsit, by rejecting the Continental System. At the beginning of 1811, Russia and England were already preparing the events of the following year;[15] and Alexander reckoned so securely on Sweden that he could venture to withdraw a great part of his troops from Finland, in order to send them to Poland. The Crown Prince had the sole conduct of Swedish affairs during the greater part of the year 1811, Charles XIII. having withdrawn

[15] Schlosser, *Gesch. des 18ten Jahrhunderts*, B. ii. S. 747. For the negociations of this period, see also Bignon, *Hist. de France sous Napoléon, depuis la paix de Tilsit*, t. x. ch. viii.

from business on account of ill health. The acquisition of Norway formed at this time a main object of Swedish policy. As France was in strict alliance with Denmark, it could hardly be expected that she would assist Sweden in wresting Norway from the Danes; while such a service might be anticipated from Russia and England, the enemies of Denmark. Here, then, was another motive with the Crown Prince, besides the insults and oppressions of Napoleon, for preferring the alliance of Russia. The French invasion of Pomerania drove the Swedes completely into the arms of Russia. In March 1812, Napoleon, who had now matured his projects against Russia, made an attempt to conciliate Sweden by offering to restore Pomerania, on condition that she should make a fresh declaration of war against England, should fire on all English vessels passing the Sound, should put on foot an army of 30,000 or 40,000 men to attack Russia when Napoleon should commence hostilities with that Power; in return for which services Napoleon also engaged to procure for Sweden the restitution of Finland.[16] The Crown Prince, who was, in fact, now negociating a treaty with Russia, replied in general terms, attributing the alienation of the Swedes to the conduct of the French Government, and especially of their ambassador, M. Alquier; he invoked, in the name of humanity, and of Napoleon's own glory, that an end should be put to a slaughter that had desolated the earth during twenty years, and offered the services of Sweden for a reconciliation between Napoleon and Alexander. But of this communication no notice appears to have been taken.

On April 5th 1812 a secret treaty was concluded at St. Petersburg between Russia and Sweden, which is important as having founded the actual system of the north of Europe. Alexander engaged to unite Norway with Sweden, either by means of negociations with Denmark, or by furnishing an army of 35,000 men. After the annexation of Norway, Sweden was to assist Russia in her war with France by throwing some 30,000 men on any point of the German coast that might be selected. On July 18th 1812, when hostilities had already broken out between France and Russia, a treaty of peace between Great Britain and Sweden was signed at Orebro;[17] which was immediately followed by an ordinance of Charles XIII., opening the Swedish ports to vessels of all nations. On the same day a treaty of peace was also signed at the same place between Great Britain and Russia; and by an imperial *ukase* of August 16th, the ports of the Russian Empire were opened to British commerce before the treaty had been ratified, such was the

[16] Garden, t. xiii. p. 20 sq. [17] Martens, *N. R.*, t. i. p. 431.

need which the Russians felt for peace.[18] No hostilities, however, actually ensued between France and Sweden till the beginning of 1813.

Both Turkey and Sweden might be valuable auxiliaries either to France or Russia in the grand 'world's debate' that was about to open; yet there was nothing in their geographical position to prevent them from remaining neutral. Such was not the case with Austria and Prussia. These Powers were too near the scene of action to remain mere passive spectators of it; a remark, however, which applies with much more force to Prussia than to Austria. The Prussian territories could hardly fail to become the actual field of battle; large bodies of French troops were already cantoned in Prussia, and occupied some of her principal fortresses. Both Austria and Prussia adopted the policy of an alliance with France. The Cabinet of Vienna excused this step on the ground that Napoleon would recognise no other neutrality than a complete disarming, which would have reduced Austria to a political nullity. The Emperor, therefore, resolved to take part in the war, but only with a determinate portion of his troops; an arrangement which would permit him to strike a decisive blow when the proper moment should arrive. In pursuance of this policy, a treaty was concluded between the Emperors Francis and Napoleon at Paris, March 14th 1812;[19] in a separate article of which it was expressly stipulated that Austria should assist France in her war with Russia.

At this period Hardenberg was again at the head of the Prussian Government, having accepted, in June 1810, the office of State-Chancellor. Under the appearance of inclining to France, Hardenberg concealed his prosecution of German interests. Neutrality and an alliance with Russia being equally out of the question, a treaty with Napoleon remained the only alternative. Already in the spring of 1811, at the first indications of a war, Frederick William III. made overtures to Napoleon for an alliance in a tone which showed Prussia no longer one of the great European Powers, but almost as much a satellite of France as the confederates of the Rhine.[20] The proposal was rejected by Napoleon on the ground of its being premature; but on February 24th 1812, an alliance, offensive and defensive, was contracted between France and Prussia, which by a secret article was expressly directed against Russia. Frederick William III., in the event of a war between that country and France, agreed to furnish 20,000 men, with sixty guns, for

[18] Garden, t. xiii. p. 408.
[19] Martens, *N. R.*, t. i. p. 427.
[20] See his letter to General Krusemarck, the Prussian ambassador at Paris, May 14th 1811, ap. Garden, t. xiii. p. 221 sqq.

active service, with the necessary baggage trains, besides large garrisons to be placed in different towns of the kingdom. He also engaged to make no levy of troops, nor any military movement, except in concert with France and for the benefit of the alliance, so long as the French army should be on Prussian territory, or on that of the enemy. In case of a prosperous termination of the war, Prussia was to be indemnified for her expenses by an addition of territory. But in spite of this alliance, Prussia was treated by the French like the country of an enemy. Up to September 1812, 77,920 horses and 13,349 carriages were taken by force from the province of Prussia, and from the eight circles alone of Eastern Prussia 22,722 oxen.[21]

Before embarking in the Russian war, Napoleon made, or pretended to make, some conciliatory overtures to England. On April 17th 1812, the Duke of Bassano, the French foreign minister, addressed a communication to Lord Castlereagh, in which he proposed the following bases of negociation: The guarantee of the integrity of Spain; the renunciation by France of all extension of territory on the side of the Pyrenees; the declaration of the independence of the *actual dynasty*, and the government of Spain by the national constitution of the Cortès. Also, the guarantee of the independence and integrity of Portugal, where the House of Braganza was to reign; the kingdom of Naples to remain in possession of the present King of Naples; the kingdom of Sicily to be guaranteed to the actual House of Sicily; Spain, Portugal, and Sicily to be evacuated both by the French and English forces. The French minister, with that peculiar tact which belongs to his countrymen of fathering on others the results of their own acts, concluded his letter by declaring, that if this, as he called it, fourth attempt at peace, dictated solely by a regard for the interests of humanity and the repose of nations, should be unsuccessful, France would at least have the consolation to reflect that the blood which might still flow would lie wholly at the door of England.[22]

The whole tenour of the French communication evidently shows that Napoleon's intention only was to attempt to set himself right with European opinion; for he could not have seriously thought that England would consent to evacuate the Peninsula and Sicily, leaving his brother and his brother-in-law masters of Spain and Naples, and himself in possession of Holland and the coasts of Northern Germany. Lord Castlereagh, in reply, observed that if by the *actual dynasty* of Spain was meant the brother of the head

[21] Garden, t. xiii. p. 239 note. [22] *Ibid.* p. 254—257.

of the French Government, and not the legitimate sovereign, Ferdinand VII. and his heirs, the Prince Regent had directed him frankly to declare that no proposition founded on such a base could be accepted. He was also instructed not to enter into recriminations on the accessory subjects of the French minister's letter. The correspondence which had taken place at the previous epochs alluded to, and the judgment which the world had long since pronounced upon it, sufficed for the justification of Great Britain. Thus the peace of Europe, it has been remarked, remained compromised because Napoleon was resolved to maintain his brother on the Spanish throne. It must, however, be admitted that, as he had by his conduct towards Ferdinand made a personal enemy of that Prince, it was hazardous to consent to his restoration. So difficult is it to regain the right path when once injustice has caused us to deviate from it.

Some threatening correspondence had taken place between the Courts of the Tuileries and St. Petersburg in the course of 1811, and on August 15th, one of those violent scenes had taken place between Napoleon and Prince Kurakin, the Russian ambassador, before the whole diplomatic circle at the Tuileries, which the French Emperor was accustomed to get up when he contemplated a war, and which served by way of manifest to the different European Courts. Napoleon terminated it by demanding that Russia should withdraw the troops which she had placed on the frontiers of Poland, and should disavow her protest against the incorporation of Oldenburg: though he had acknowledged in the course of the conversation that he had been ignorant of the nature of the relations between that duchy and Russia, and that, had he been acquainted with them, he should not have annexed it. Alexander refused to give up Oldenburg; but he offered to place his forces on the footing of peace, if Napoleon would do the same. He had no intention, however, to make the affair of Oldenburg a cause of war,[23] and all the military preparations which he had made were purely defensive. Prince Kurakin delivered to the French Government, April 30th 1812, a note which may be regarded as the Russian ultimatum. It demanded the conservation of Prussia, and its independence of any political bond directed against Russia, a formal engagement for the entire evacuation of the Prussian States and fortresses, a diminution of the garrison of Dantzic, the evacuation of Swedish Pomerania, and an arrangement with the King of Sweden. Alexander, on his side, promised to make no

[23] See M. Knesebeck's Report to the King of Prussia, from St. Petersburg, March 23rd 1812, Garden, t. xiii. p. 302.

change in the prohibitive measures he had adopted against direct commerce with England, and to come to an understanding with France about a system of licenses. He also engaged to negociate with France a commercial treaty, and to persuade the Duke of Oldenburg to accept a suitable equivalent for his duchy.[24] This note remained unanswered, and after a little mere formal correspondence the rupture was complete.

The marriage of Napoleon with an Austrian princess, the apparent consolidation of his dynasty the following year by the birth of a son (March 20th 1811), who received the title of King of Rome, had lulled the French nation with false hopes of peace; nor was it till the last moment that they were undeceived. The real object of the Emperor's vast preparations was disguised under the most various and sometimes the most absurd pretences. Napoleon himself seems to have entertained till the last moment a hope that Alexander would not suffer matters to come to extremities, but that, dismayed by the mighty force arrayed against him, he would conjure the storm by yielding the demands of France. Napoleon had made all his arrangements by the end of February 1812. Germany bore the appearance of a vast camp. The official state of Napoleon's army gave a total of 678,080 men, of whom considerably more than half were French. The remainder was composed of Germans, Austrians, Poles, Italians, and other foreigners. Making the usual deductions, the effective force may be estimated at considerably more than half a million men; having with them 1372 guns, and followed by more than 20,000 wagons and other carriages.

On the 9th of May, after providing for the conduct of affairs during his absence, Napoleon, accompanied by the Empress, left St. Cloud for Dresden. The principal sovereigns of Germany had been invited to meet him in that city; a Congress designed, not merely for the gratification of Napoleon's pride, but to draw more closely his alliance with its members, as well as to dazzle the eyes of Russia, and to inspire it, perhaps, even at the eleventh hour, with a desire for peace. He arrived in Dresden May 16th, and took up his residence in the royal palace. On the following day appeared the Emperor and Empress of Austria, with the Archdukes, the Queen of Westphalia, the Duke of Saxe Weimar, the Duke of Saxe Coburg, and, successively, most of the princes of the Confederation of the Rhine, with their principal ministers. The King of Prussia arrived a few days later, having, according to a previous arrangement, at first expected to receive Napoleon in Berlin.[25]

[24] Garden, t. xiii. p. 314.

[25] See for these affairs De Pradt, *Hist. de l'Ambassade de Varsovie.*

In the midst of all the fêtes and splendour of his residence at Dresden, Napoleon employed himself in making the last arrangements for the campaign. The arrival of Count de Narbonne at Dresden, May 28th, who had been despatched to St. Petersburg to make a last attempt to conciliate the Emperor of Russia, put an end to all hopes of that description. Alexander was inflexible. His last words to the French ambassador were, that Napoleon might cross the Niemen, but that he would never sign a peace dictated on Russian territory. The very next day Napoleon left Dresden to join his army. After arranging at Thorn the affairs of the Duchy of Warsaw, he appeared at Dantzic, June 6th, and declared that town united to the French Empire. Thence he arrived at the headquarters at Königsberg, June 12th. At Gumbinnen, the frontier town of East Prussia, the rupture was finally declared, June 21st. The declaration of war of the Emperor of Russia was published, July 6th, at Vilna, where he had fixed his headquarters; since the French operations having for their bases the fortresses of the Lower Vistula and Pregel, the attack would necessarily be made in this quarter.[26]

The Russian line of defence was formed by three armies. The first of these, occupying the Niemen, and consisting of 140,000 men under Barclay de Tolly, was supported by Riga and Dunaburg, and a vast entrenched camp at Drissa. The advanced guard occupied Kovno; the centre, under the Grand Duke Constantine, was posted at Vilna and the environs; the right wing, commanded by Wittgenstein, secured, at Rossieny and Keydany, the roads to St. Petersburg; the left, under Doctorof, was stationed between Grodno and Lida, covering the by-roads towards Moscow. The second army of about 50,000 men, under Prince Bagration, was concentrated more to the south, between Bialystok and Wolkowisk, threatening the flank of the invaders. The third army, still further south, was assembled at Loutzk, on the road between Vienna and Kief; it consisted of about 45,000 men, under Tormassof, and was destined, like the army of Bagration, to act on the offensive. The Russians had besides about 40,000 men in different garrisons; to which must be added the army of Moldavia of 60,000 men, ultimately released by the Peace of Bucharest, as

[26] The principal works on the Russian campaign are Chambray, *Hist. de l'Expéd. de Russie*; Labeaume, *Relation de la Campagne de Russie*; Ségur, *Hist. de Napoléon et de la Grande Armée pendant l'Année* 1812; Boutourlin (adjutant to the Emperor Alexander), *Hist. Milit. de la Campagne de Russie*; Ducasse, *Mém. pour servir à l'Hist. de la Campagne de* 1812 *en Russie, suivis des Lettres de Napoléon au Roi de Westphalie pendant la Campagne de* 1813 (Paris, 1852). This last work throws new light on different points from authentic documents.

well as some regiments withdrawn from Finland, and the militia and volunteers of Moscow and St. Petersburg, 120,000 men.

Such was the line of defence, against which Napoleon divided his army into five columns of attack. Macdonald, with the extreme left, was to advance from Tilsit, and hold Wittgenstein in check. The Emperor himself, with Davoust, Oudinot, Ney, Murat, and the Imperial Guard, marched to attack the Russian advanced guard and centre at Kovno and Vilna. Prince Eugène, with the third column, was to throw himself between Barclay de Tolly and Doctorof. The King of Westphalia, with the fourth, was to debouch by Grodno, and advance upon Bagration. Finally, Prince Schwarzenberg, with the fifth column, on the extreme right, was directed to hold Tormassof in check and to cover the Duchy of Warsaw.

Napoleon, with 250,000 men, crossed the Niemen on the night of June 23rd. His object was to gain the elevated plateau forming the watershed which separates the sources of the Dvina and the Dniepr; the first of which, running northwards, falls into the Baltic, while the other, taking a southerly course, discharges itself into the Black Sea. On the northern side of this plateau, on the banks of the Dvina, stands the town of Vitebsk; on the southern, upon the Dniepr, Smolensk; thus forming a position which, by a decisive battle, would open to Napoleon the road either to St. Petersburg or Moscow. At his approach the Russians abandoned Kovno and Vilna, which latter place he entered June 28th. Eugène and Jerôme had delayed their advance not to alarm Bagration prematurely. It was not till the 30th that they passed the Niemen; Eugène at Pilony, Jerôme at Grodno. The evening before, a terrible storm had burst over Lithuania, succeeded by a hurricane, inundations, and excessive cold. In that and the two following days 10,000 horses are said to have perished; the roads having become impracticable, the march of the troops was suspended, 100 guns were abandoned, and an immense quantity of provisions and ammunition was sacrificed for want of transport. Jerôme was detained at Grodno till July 4th, and hence Napoleon also was compelled to suspend his operations. But this delay is not to be imputed, as it has hitherto been by most historians, to the King of Westphalia.

The Bishop of Mechlin (De Pradt), who had been sent as ambassador to Warsaw, convoked in that city an extraordinary diet, which having assembled, June 26th, immediately constituted itself a General Confederation for Poland, and declared the re-establishment of the Polish Kingdom and nation. The King of Saxony

signed his adherence to the Confederation July 12th. But Napoleon, though such a re-establishment entered ultimately into his views, hesitated at present to alienate his Austrian and Prussian allies by sanctioning such a step, and gave only an evasive answer to the deputation which had been despatched to solicit his consent. Napoleon established at Vilna a section of the Imperial Cabinet, with the Duke of Bassano at the head; so that foreign envoys, who at present followed his movements, might transact their business there with his foreign minister. He also instituted a provincial government of Lithuania, and caused proclamations to be published, exhorting the inhabitants to throw off the Russian yoke. But these appeals met with little or no response. The Lithuanians, assimilated to the Russians by a common language and religion, had experienced at the hands of the Imperial Government a far more considerate treatment than Prussia had adopted towards her Polish subjects.

Barclay de Tolly had retired to the entrenched camp at Drissa, on the Dwina, whither he was followed by Ney and Oudinot. On their approach, the Russian general retreated upon Witebsk and Smolensk, and at the latter place he formed a junction with Bagration.[27] That general had also retreated before Davoust, who had now superseded the King of Westphalia in the command of the French right wing. Davoust had endeavoured to intercept Bagration's march, but, by a battle which the Russians offered him at Mohileff, July 23rd, was frustrated in that design. On July 25th and two following days, Murat and Eugène fought some bloody battles at Ostrowno with the rear-guard of Barclay de Tolly's army, in which they lost a great many men. At the approach of the French, Witebsk was burnt and abandoned by the Russians, who concentrated their forces at Smolensk. During these events, Tormassof, with the Russian left, had succeeded in holding in check the extreme right of the French, composed of Austrians and Saxons under Prince Schwarzenberg.

The extreme heat of the weather and the privations endured by the French army—for the Russians as they retreated had destroyed their magazines at Vilna and other places—induced Napoleon to

[27] The constant retreat of the Russians has sometimes been ascribed to a concerted plan to draw the French into the interior. This is a mistake. The Russians retreated from necessity before superior forces; first to Smolensk, to unite their two armies, and then to Moscow, to gain their reserves. To show the fallacy of the other view, it is only necessary to mention the enormous magazines which the Russians had collected at Vilna, and which they were compelled to destroy; and to advert to the consideration that if Napoleon had decided on terminating the first campaign at Smolensk, the Russian retreat would have been worse than useless. Boutourlin's account shows that the Russians retreated only from necessity.

rest his men for the space of a fortnight at Vitebsk (July 28th—August 10th). Napoleon had previously lost seventeen days at Vilna; a delay considered by military critics as the greatest error he ever committed. On August 10th, the French army began to move upon Smolensk. On the 14th, a serious engagement took place at Krasnoï, in which Murat and Ney were victorious. On the 16th, the French army appeared before Smolensk. This place was regarded as the key of Moscow, and Napoleon resolved to take it by assault. The attack lasted the whole of the 17th, and in the evening he was master of the town. But the victory had cost him 12,000 men, and he found only a heap of smoking ruins. The Russians, as usual, had fired the town before abandoning it. Ney crossed the Dniepr in pursuit of the Russians, who had taken up a strong position at Valutina, from which they were only dislodged after destroying 6000 or 7000 of their assailants (August 19th). Gouvion St. Cyr, who had succeeded Oudinot, disabled by a wound, gained a decisive victory over Wittgenstein at Polotsk, August 18th, which procured for him the bâton of marshal.

Many of Napoleon's generals were of opinion that the campaign should now be terminated, that winter quarters should be established on the Dniepr, and operations resumed on the return of spring. But on the 24th, the order was given to march on Moscow. The Russians made a stand at Dorogobuch, but abandoned it as soon as they had set fire to the town and the magazines. Viasma and Gjatsk shared the same fate. This continued incendiarism filled the French with astonishment and horror. Never before had they experienced a warfare of that kind; no conception of such sacrifices for the sake of national independence had ever crossed their minds. A constant rain, a desolate country, and sometimes an entire want of water, added to their embarrassment and distress. The loss both of men and horses was enormous; nevertheless, Napoleon was determined to proceed. Gjatsk was left September 4th, and Mojaïsk was now the only town before arriving at Moscow. At this time the command in chief of the Russian armies was transferred from Barclay de Tolly to Count Kutusoff; for though the military talents of the former general were undisputed, Alexander, in appointing Kutusoff, complied with the general wish of the nation that the forces should be commanded by a Russian.

Between Gjatsk and Mojaïsk, the main road is crossed by the little river Kologa, which at a short distance falls into the Moskva. On the further side of the stream, encircling the village of Borodino, rises an amphitheatre of well-wooded hills, cleft by ravines, forming an admirable defensive position. In this place, strong by

nature, and rendered still stronger by forts and redans, Kutusoff had entrenched his army. Napoleon recognised at a glance the strength of the position, but at the same time discovered a weak point, and resolved on the attack. The assault began on the morning of September 7th, and lasted all day. The Russians were ultimately driven from their position, but the morning of the 8th discovered at what expense. The field of battle was strewn with 80,000 killed or wounded men, considerably more than half of whom were Russians. Among the wounded was Prince Bagration, who died a few days after. The French loss amounted to 28,000 men, including 12 general officers killed and 39 wounded.

Although the French had gained no very decisive victory, Kutusoff, in consideration of his terrible loss, resolved to retire upon Moscow, and he took up a position in front of that city. But as his army consisted of only 90,000 men, of whom a great part were new levies and badly armed, there was no chance of successfully opposing Napoleon. On the approach of the French, the Russians defiling through Moscow, soon vanished in the vast plains to the east, and on the 18th of September, Murat and Eugène presented themselves at the gates of the ancient capital of the Czars. At the sight of its towers, its palaces, and gilded domes, the French soldiery were filled with hope and joy, imagining that they had at length reached the term of all their labours and privations. But these anticipations were soon dissipated. On entering the city, it was discovered that all that remained of its vast population were some 12,000 or 15,000 persons, either foreigners or the dregs of the people. The rest of the inhabitants had taken flight; the houses were all shut up, silence reigned in the deserted streets, striking a deeper terror into the heart than the tumult of battle. Napoleon entered the city on the 15th, and took up his residence in the Kremlin. He could not conceal the sinister presages which crowded on his mind. Never before had he fought with a people who thus defended themselves. All around was desolation, and famine stared him in the face.

While he was giving vent to his lamentations, a new horror suddenly presented itself. The night was well advanced, when from the windows of the Kremlin the whole horizon seemed to glow with innumerable fires. Some had been observed the day before, which had been attributed to accident; but now there could be no doubt that the destruction of Moscow had been systematically organised. It had, indeed, been planned and executed by Count Rostoptchin, the governor of the city. Combustible materials had been placed in many houses, which were fired by a troop of paid

incendiaries, under the directions of the police. The flames baffled all the exertions of the French to extinguish them. On the third day a strong north-west wind spread the fire over the whole city. During five days nothing was to be seen but an ocean of flame, which at length began to encompass the Kremlin, and compelled Napoleon to fly to the château of Petrofskoïe, about three miles from the town. But in a few days he returned to the Kremlin. That palace, the churches, and about a tenth part of the houses, had escaped destruction. All Napoleon's plans, however, were completely overthrown. In occupying Moscow, he had fancied that he should conquer the Russian Empire; but he found to his dismay that the Russians regarded that capital only as a heap of stones.

Many plans of operation were now suggested by Napoleon's generals. He himself had from the first decided for a retreat, but this could not be effected all at once. He had to collect provisions and ammunition, to take care of the sick and wounded, to provide and organise the means of transport. He employed this interval in attempting to open negociations with the Russian Emperor; but without effect. Alexander had resolved not to treat while a Frenchman remained in his dominions; and all Napoleon's overtures were left unanswered. The defeat of Murat, October 18th, hastened Napoleon's departure. The Russians had assaulted the cantonments of the King of Naples, and captured 2000 men and 12 guns. Moscow would not much longer be safe, and the order of departure was given for the following day.

We can only record some of the more prominent incidents of the memorable retreat from Moscow, perhaps the most disastrous on record since the days of Xerxes. Before leaving, Napoleon directed the Kremlin to be blown up—an act of barbarous malice which might have disgraced a Genseric or Attila. Fortunately, the explosion caused only partial damage. Napoleon's plan of retreat does not show his usual decision. Kutusoff had got into his front, intercepting the road to Smolensk. Napoleon at first determined to march on Kalouga, form a junction with Murat, and take a more southern route than that by which he had advanced, through the valley of the Lougra, which had not been exhausted of provisions. But at Malo-Jaroslavetz the Russians delivered an obstinate battle, October 24th; and though the French remained victorious, Napoleon decided on regaining the former road, by Gjatsk and Viasma. Thus, after ten days' march, the army found itself again only thirty or forty miles from Moscow,—a circumstance which began to fill the soldiery with anxiety. The temperature,

moreover, began to fall, the Cossacks to appear. Kutusoff hovered round the French, but avoided an engagement, unwilling to risk his men in securing a prey which he knew must fall by cold, hunger, and fatigue. The French, however, arrived in tolerable safety at Dorogobuch, November 5th; but after this point all the horrors of the retreat began. On the night of November 6th, the temperature suddenly fell to that of the most rigorous winter. In that dreadful night thousands of men perished, and nearly all the horses, which compelled the abandonment of the greater part of the convoys. From this point the road began to be strewn with corpses, presenting the aspect of a continuous battle-field. Some were observed who, delirious with hunger, devoured the bodies of their dead comrades! All was now confusion and disorder; discipline was no longer observed except by the guard, in the centre of which proceeded the carriage containing the Emperor and the King of Naples. The French van entered Smolensk November 9th. Kutusoff had fallen upon Baraguay d'Hilliers at Liakhovo, and destroyed the whole brigade Augereau. Eugène, who had struck to the right to reach Vitebsk, hearing that that place was occupied by Wittgenstein, had been forced to retrace his steps towards Smolensk, crossing the Vop on the ice, penetrating through almost impracticable marshes, and exposed at the same time to the attacks of the Cossacks. He at length rejoined the main army, but with the loss of all his artillery, convoys, wounded, and stragglers.

At Smolensk there were still 40,000 men under arms, but ill provided with ammunition and provisions. The cold was at 20 degrees of Réaumur. Here Napoleon divided his army into four corps. He himself with the Imperial Guard left Smolensk November 14th, directing Eugène to follow him in a few hours. Davoust was to march on the 14th, while Ney, who commanded the rear-guard, was not to leave the town till the 17th, after blowing up the walls. In this order they were to march upon Krasnoï, the defile at which place presents a sort of natural ambuscade. These arrangements have been censured by military critics as inconceivable mistakes. The Russians, who were marching parallel to, and at a short distance from, the French, arrived at Krasnoï before them, and had thus the opportunity to attack each division separately. Napoleon, it is said, should have advanced with all his columns abreast by the roads which run parallel with the high road—a disposition by which they would not only have arrived simultaneously at Krasnoï, but which would also have better enabled them to find subsistence. The Russians suffered Napoleon to pass; but

Eugène with the second column was attacked, and in order to reach Krasnoï was compelled to make a long *détour* in the night. Davoust was also attacked, but was released from his dangerous situation by a diversion caused by Napoleon attacking the Russian corps nearest Krasnoï. Ney, with the rear-guard of 6000 men, suffered most severely. Napoleon could not wait for him without delivering a general engagement, and he had therefore to cut his way through the Russian army. This he effected with consummate gallantry, and reached the general quarters at Orcha; but with only 800 or 900 men![28]

The arrival at Orcha on the Dniepr terminates the first act of this bloody drama. Napoleon had left Moscow with upwards of 100,000 combatants and more than 550 guns. He had now about 30,000 men and 25 pieces of artillery; his cavalry was almost annihilated. The remainder of the march seemed to promise fewer hardships and dangers. The Russians had been outmarched; a new park of artillery had been obtained, and it was hoped that the army would soon be strengthened by a junction with the divisions of Dombrowski and Oudinot. But on the other hand, Wittgenstein, advancing from the north, had defeated St. Cyr, October 18th and 20th, at Polotsk, occupied Witebsk, November 7th, and was marching to join Tchitchagof, who, with the Russian troops from Moldavia, had seized Borissof, November 21st, destroyed the bridge, and thus intercepted the passage of the Beresina. The Emperor arrived at Borissof on the 25th, and finding the bridge destroyed, resolved to cross at Studianka, twelve miles higher up the stream, where Oudinot was directed to construct bridges. Here the Emperor and a considerable part of the army effected their passage, November 27th. But in the night the most frightful disorder ensued. Both ends of the bridge had become choked with carriages in inextricable confusion, when Wittgenstein, coming up early in the morning, directed a terrible cannonade upon the bridge. Many endeavoured to save themselves by fording or swimming the river, but for the most part perished in the attempt. Among the victims were many women and children who had accompanied the army. An obstinate battle was also delivered here between Victor and Wittgenstein. At length, on the 29th, Victor, by order of Napoleon, after burning all the carriages which encumbered the bridges and their avenues, and finally the bridges themselves, hastened to join the main army, which had

[28] De Fezenac, *Journal de la Campagne de Russie en* 1812. The author, who commanded a regiment of 3000 men in Ney's division, brought back 200 to the Vistula! Ap. Garden, xiii. 463.

preceded him, still leaving on the left bank a small rear-guard and upwards of 12,000 non-combatants.

The march was now pursued towards Vilna, the frosts of each night carrying off numerous victims. At Smorgoni, Napoleon, appointing the King of Naples to the command in chief, took leave of his principal officers, and set off in all haste for Paris (December 5th). His departure was prepared by a little concerted scene. Murat, Prince Eugène, the Duke of Istria, urged him to depart; when Napoleon, in a well-simulated fit of rage, made at the Duke of Istria with his drawn sword, exclaiming that "None but his mortal enemy could advise him to quit the army." In the evening, however, he sent for the Duke, and told him that, as they all desired it, he should leave.[29] His departure has perhaps been too severely censured. He could no longer be of much service to the army, while his presence in Paris was absolutely necessary. An event which had occurred in Paris showed how precarious was his hold of power, and that while he was dreaming of conquering the world, even the sceptre of France might be wrested from his grasp. On October 23rd, General Malet, a man of republican principles, and a few coadjutors, by spreading a report of Napoleon's death, and forging some pretended orders, obtained the command of a considerable military force, and remained for a few hours master of Paris. The imposture was, however, soon discovered, and was expiated not only by the death of Malet and his confederates, but also of the military officers whom he had deceived.

Napoleon, travelling rapidly by way of Vilna, Warsaw, and Dresden, arrived unexpectedly in Paris on the night of December 18th. His departure caused great dissatisfaction among the troops, and increased their disorganisation. Curses rose on all sides against the betrayer, who, as in Egypt, had first sacrificed his men, and then abandoned them. The march was resumed under the most gloomy auspices, the cold increasing in intensity. General Gratien, with a corps of 12,000 men, principally Germans, had left Vilna to meet the retreating army, and formed a junction with them at Ochmiana; but only half Gratien's men had survived the march; the rest perished in the night of December 6th! Vilna was reached on the 8th, but the French could make no stay there—the Russians were at their heels. On leaving the town they had to surmount a hill, the road over which had become a sheet of ice, rendering it entirely impracticable for horses. All the carriages and wagons were left at the bottom, and it became

[29] Chateaubriand, ap. Garden, t. xiv. p. 20 note.

necessary to burn them, to prevent them from becoming the prey of Platoff and his Cossacks. Among them was the military chest, which was abandoned to pillage. At length the small remains of that brilliant and numerous army, which six months before had entered Kovno, regained that town, and crossed the Niemen. Three hundred thousand corpses, French, Italian, and German, had been burnt on the road between Moscow and Vilna![30] At Gumbinnen, the frontier town of Prussia, a man in a brown great coat, with a long beard, inflamed eyes, and a face all scorched and blackened, presented himself before General Dumas. "Here I am at last," he exclaimed. "What! don't you know me, Dumas?" "No; who are you?" "I am Marshal Ney, the rear-guard of the grand army. I fired the last shot on the bridge of Kovno, I threw the last of our arms into the Niemen, and found my way hither through the woods!"

Ney, "the bravest of the brave," is the hero of the retreat from Moscow.

[30] Official account, ap. Garden, t. xiii. p. 484. The fourth *corps d'armée* of 48,000 men, to which Capt. Labeaume belonged, at last took up its quarters in one room! See his *Relation Circonstanciée.*

CHAPTER XVI.

NAPOLEON'S twenty-ninth bulletin from Molodetschno, which arrived in Paris only two days before himself, had at length communicated the real state of the grand army, and filled the Parisians with consternation. It concluded with the assurance that "His Majesty's health had never been better;" a phrase which, from any other man in such circumstances, might have been received as mockery and insult. But Napoleon knew his public, and reckoned with well-placed confidence on the dominion which he exercised over their minds. He was welcomed by the legislative body with its usual servile adulation, and in a few days the misfortunes of the Russian campaign seemed to be forgotten. Napoleon immediately began to prepare for the great struggle which awaited him. The conspiracy of Malet had shown that his dynasty depended only on his own life. To obviate this danger he determined on the establishment of a Regency. A law was passed for that purpose, and the Emperor, by letters patent of March 30th, appointed the Empress Maria Louisa regent. The Arch-Chancellor Cambacérès was named first counsellor of the Regency, the Duke of Cadore (Champagny) secretary. In order to strengthen his government by conciliating the clergy, who, since his misfortunes, had displayed strong symptoms of opposition, Napoleon reconciled himself with Pope Pius VII., who was still residing at Fontainebleau, and concluded with him a new Concordat. But his principal cares were directed to the raising of an army. As the conscription of 1812 was far from sufficing for that purpose, a decree was issued requiring 100,000 men from the national guard, another 100,000 from the conscriptions of the last four years, and the same number from the conscription of 1814. The latter was raised to 150,000, and thus the army was reinforced by a total of 350,000 men. But this was not all. Appeals were made to the patriotism and to the fears of the nation. The cry of 1793 against the Coalition was again raised, the country was proclaimed to be in danger, and under the influence of the excitement thus produced, the senate voted, April 3rd — Prussia having then declared herself — another 180,000 men.

Among these was to be a guard of honour of 10,000 young men selected from the foremost families of France.[1] Thus the French army was again put upon a most formidable footing; but it was very deficient in cavalry, especially light horse—a circumstance which deprived Napoleon's victories in 1813 of all adequate results.

One of the first consequences of the Russian campaign was the abandonment of Napoleon by his German allies, for which the Prussian general York had given the signal. Instead of joining Marshal Macdonald, the commander of his division, at Tilsit, York had concluded with the Russian general Diebitsch a capitulation at Tauroggen, Dec. 20th 1812, by which the Prussian corps was to separate itself from the French army and remain neutral. York, in concluding this convention, believed himself to be acting in conformity with the secret wishes of Frederick William III., and though that monarch and his minister Hardenberg deemed it proper, or politic, to censure the act, and even to supersede York by General Kleist, yet his act ultimately obtained a formal approval (March 11th). The general feeling of the Prussians, and especially of some of their leading men, inclined for an alliance with Russia. Many distinguished Prussians had actually entered Alexander's service. The Baron von Stein had been in constant attendance upon him since May 1812; while Clausewitz and several other Prussian staff-officers had taken service in the Russian army. When, by the progress of the Russian arms, Stein was enabled to visit Königsberg, he assembled the States of Prussia, and with the help of Dohna and Clausewitz organised a militia of 30,000 men.

Hardenberg, however, at first deemed it prudent to deceive Napoleon by renewed professions of friendship. In order to obviate the impression which York's defection was likely to produce in France, Prince Hatzfeldt was despatched to Paris in January 1813 with assurances of steadfast alliance on the part of Prussia. Yet at the same time, Frederick William was negociating with Russia, and, for the purpose of better concealment, at Stockholm. Soon after, General Krusemark was sent ambassador to Paris, to prepare matters gradually for a rupture. He was instructed to demand 93,000,000 francs as an excess of supplies furnished to the French armies under the Convention of February 1812. Towards the end of January the King of Prussia suddenly left Potsdam, where he was in danger of a *coup de main* on the

[1] Bignon, t. xii. p. 4.

part of the French, and proceeded to Breslau; taking with him, however, the French ambassador. But after this step his intentions could not much longer be concealed, especially as he now began to be surrounded by such men as Blücher, Gneisenau, and Scharnhorst. On February 3rd he issued a proclamation calling to arms all Prussians from the age of seventeen to forty-four, and he soon after authorised the formation of volunteer corps. By engagements with France, the regular army, as we have seen, could not be carried beyond 42,000 men; but so large a portion of the Prussian youth had been quietly exercised in the use of arms, that the King could at any time dispose of 150,000 men. A treaty of alliance with Russia was signed by Hardenberg at Breslau, February 27th, and on the following day by Kutusoff at Kalisch.[2] By this treaty Russia engaged to provide 150,000 men for the ensuing war, and Prussia at least 80,000, exclusive of garrisons. By a separate and secret article, the Emperor of Russia undertook that Frederick William should be reinstated in all the dominions which he had possessed before the war of 1806, with the exception of the Electorate of Hanover. Alexander himself arrived at Breslau March 15th, and on the following day the Russian alliance was notified to the French ambassador, who immediately took his departure. On March 27th, Krusemark delivered to the French foreign minister the Prussian declaration of war. The reply of the Duke of Bassano is perhaps one of the most cutting diplomatic letters ever written.[3] All that was worthy of consideration, he observes, in the Prussian note, reduces itself to this. In 1812, Prussia solicited an alliance with France because the French armies were nearer than the Russian to the Prussian States. In 1813, Prussia violates these treaties because the Russian armies are nearer than the French armies. He then goes on to expose the shifts and perfidy of the Prussian Government ever since the French Revolution. In 1792, when France seemed to be on the verge of destruction, Prussia made war upon her. Three years later, when France began to triumph, Prussia abandoned her allies, passed, with Fortune, to the side of the Convention, and was the first of the allied Powers to acknowledge the French Republic. In 1796, after the French reverses in Italy, Prussia again began to veer, but returned to the old point after the defeat of the Russians at Zürich and the English in Holland. In 1805, when France was menaced by Austria and Russia, Prussia concluded with Alexander the Treaty of Berlin, and vowed eternal

[2] The text of the treaty is in Garden, t. xiv. p. 167 sqq.

[3] It will be found in Garden, t. xiv. p. 270 sqq.

enmity to France on the ashes of Frederick the Great. Yet six weeks had scarcely elapsed when, after the battle of Austerlitz, Prussia tore up this treaty, abjured the celebrated oath of Potsdam, and betrayed Russia as she had before betrayed France!

As a complement to the alliance of February 27th, an agreement was concluded between Russia and Prussia, March 19th, as to the method of conducting the war. All German princes who did not aid in the war of liberation were to be declared deposed from their thrones. The dissolution of the Confederation of the Rhine had been proclaimed by Field-Marshal Kutusoff at Kalisch, March 25th. The Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin had renounced it before the appearance of this proclamation (March 14th), and the Duke of Mecklenburg-Strelitz followed soon after (March 30th).

Austria, like Prussia, was preparing to throw off the French alliance covertly, and by degrees, although it seems certain that the Cabinet of Vienna had already determined, in the middle of December, on joining Russia.[4] Prince Schwarzenberg had conducted the war on the part of Austria without any vigour. At the invitation of Alexander, he had concluded at Warsaw an armistice with the Russians, December 21st, and towards the end of January 1813, he retired towards Cracow and the frontiers of Galicia, taking with him Poniatowski and the Polish army, and abandoning Warsaw to the Russians by capitulation. Lebzeltern, the Austrian plenipotentiary, concluded with the Russian minister, Count Nesselrode, at Kalisch, March 29th, a secret arrangement, by which the Russians were to denounce the armistice, and to feign an attack with superior forces, when the Austrians would retire to the right bank of the Vistula, thus abandoning the Duchy of Warsaw. It is said that Count Bubna, the Austrian ambassador at Paris, was instructed to try whether Napoleon would bid a higher price than the allies for Austria's friendship. Napoleon offered Silesia, but would relinquish nothing that he had annexed to France. He declared, "If the enemy was already at Montmartre, I would not give up a single village." A year after, Montmartre was actually occupied by the allies.[5] Austria assumed for the present the attitude of an armed neutrality, and offered her mediation; in which policy she was joined by Saxony. The allies had hoped to draw the King of Saxony to their cause, and that his example would decide the other confederates of the Rhine. But Frederick Augustus III. turned a deaf ear to their overtures; retired to Plauen, then to Ratisbon, in the dominions of his

[4] See a conversation of Metternich, quoted by Garden, t. xiv. p. 160.
[5] Mailath, B. v. S. 322.

brother-in-law, King Maximilian Joseph; and finally, towards the end of April, at the invitation of the Emperor Francis, to Prague; whither he was accompanied by his family and troops. By the Convention of Vienna, he had agreed to cede the Duchy of Warsaw, if that point should be made an indispensable condition of peace; Austria undertaking that he should receive a suitable indemnification so far as circumstances should permit.[6]

Great Britain, besides the part she was taking in the Peninsular war, was also engaged at this time in a war with the United States of North America, arising out of maritime questions connected with the Continental System. Into this war, however, which lasted from June 1812 to the Peace of Ghent, December 24th 1814, it is not our intention to enter. It had little or no effect on the general affairs of Europe; it belongs properly to the domestic history of England, and will be found related in all the works on that subject. But, although the two wars alluded to were enough to occupy the attention, and employ the resources, of Great Britain, she, nevertheless, took an active part in the affairs of the Continent.

We have seen that, by the treaty between Sweden and Russia, of April 5th 1812, the former Power had engaged to take part in the war against Napoleon, *after* she should have been put in possession of Norway. The English Government, when their accession to this Convention was requested, appeared disposed to support it with subsidies; but, probably from a suspicion that Bernadotte was the secret friend of Napoleon, they required that Sweden should first take an active part in the war, by sending an army into Germany. So long as Prussia remained the ally of France, this step was impracticable; but, after the catastrophe of the French army, the objection vanished. In the spring of 1813, negociations were renewed with Sweden, and on the 3rd of March a treaty was concluded at Stockholm, between that Power and Great Britain. The English Government was desirous that Denmark should be made a party to the arrangements, which included the cession of Norway to Sweden, and negociations were opened, through Russia, with the Danish Government. Sweden declared that she should be content with the Norwegian duchy of Drontheim, as the possession of that province would release her armies from the danger of being turned by the Danes, and she offered in exchange her possessions in Pomerania. These proposals were, however, rejected, and Sweden then reverted to her demand of all

[6] Garden, t. xiv. p. 292 sq.

Norway. By the treaty mentioned, Great Britain agreed to co-operate in that purpose. Sweden engaged to employ on the Continent an army of at least 30,000 men, under the command of the Crown Prince, and Great Britain undertook to furnish a million sterling for their equipment and maintenance. She also ceded to Sweden the French island of Guadeloupe, which she had conquered. Sweden opened the ports of Gothenburg, Karlshamn, and Stralsund, as *entrepôts* for British and colonial goods; which were to pay an *ad valorem* duty of one per cent. on entering and leaving.[7] Prussia also concluded a treaty with Sweden, April 22nd 1813, by which she engaged to add a corps of 27,000 men to the army commanded by the Crown Prince, and Charles XIII. also entered into an alliance with the provisional Spanish Government; March 19th. But, in spite of these treaties, it was not till the following August that Sweden declared war against France.

Napoleon no sooner ascertained the intention of Charles XIII. to enter the Coalition, than he threatened to send 40,000 men to the aid of Denmark. The Crown Prince answered this threat by his celebrated letter of March 23rd 1813, in the composition of which Madame de Staël is supposed to have been concerned. Bernadotte formed a counter-scheme to overthrow Napoleon, by means of the French themselves, by recalling General Moreau from banishment, who was then residing at Morrisville, in New Jersey. It was thought that many of the French would join the hero of Hohenlinden, including the prisoners set at liberty by Russia and England. Moreau was sent for, and arrived at Helsingborg, August 6th, but, unfortunately, only to meet his death shortly after.

The Emperor of Russia had also succeeded in conciliating the Poles to his cause, chiefly by means of his friend and confidant, the Polish prince George Adam Czartorinsky. A Russian party had been organised by Czartorinsky in Warsaw, which looked forward to the re-erection of the Kingdom of Poland, not by means of Napoleon, but through the powerful and beneficent Emperor of Russia. The Polish nobles doubted not the feasibility of the project, as it was given out that a Russian prince was to rule the re-established kingdom. Alexander appears not to have given any direct sanction to this scheme; but he assured the Poles of his friendship, and promised that his troops should treat them as friends and brothers.

Napoleon started from St. Cloud, to take the command of his

[7] Garden, t. xiv. p. 356.

armies in Germany, April 15th 1813. But before we describe the commencement of the campaign, it will be necessary to advert to the movements of the grand army of Russia after its abandonment by Napoleon, and the assumption of the command by his brother-in-law, the King of Naples. Murat had conducted the retreat by Königsberg and Dantzic as far as Posen, when he told his officers that it was no longer possible to serve a madman; that there was not a sovereign in Europe who any longer trusted Napoleon's word or his treaties; that for his own part he could have made peace with England; that he was as much the King of Naples as Francis was Emperor of Austria. It was in vain that Davoust, the Prince of Neufchâtel and the Viceroy Eugène remonstrated; Murat set off by post, January 16th, for his Neapolitan dominions in the disguise of a German traveller, thus abandoning the trust which Napoleon had confided to him. After his departure, Eugène had the courage to place himself at the head of the remnant of the grand army, about 12,000 men. The retreat from Posen to Leipsic reflects on Eugène the greatest honour. He arrived at Leipsic, by way of Berlin and Wittenberg, March 9th, and having been joined on his march by many scattered bands, he then counted 50,000 men under his standards. Thus when all seemed lost he was mainly instrumental in restoring the balance of fortune, and gained time for Napoleon to reappear upon the scene. Besides the force under Eugène, there were also upwards of 60,000 French distributed in Prussian and Polish fortresses.

Meanwhile the Russians had entered Prussia, and were everywhere received by the inhabitants as deliverers. Some of their light troops having pushed on as far as Hamburg, the inhabitants rose against the French garrison, which had been much reduced by the departure of General Lauriston, and constrained General Carra St. Cyr to cross the Elbe; when the Russian troops were admitted into the town, March 18th, and the port was thrown open to the English. Wittgenstein, leaving Berlin with the Russian van, March 29th, met and defeated Eugène at Möckern, April 5th, who thereupon retreated on Magdeburg, and ultimately took up a position on the Saale, while Wittgenstein fixed his quarters at Dessau. The main body of the Russians, under Alexander in person and Kutusoff, was at this time at Kalisch. The Prussian army had also been placed under the command-in-chief of Kutusoff. The allied army began to move, April 7th. Winzingerode and Blücher traversing Lusatia, arrived before Dresden, when Davoust retired with his forces, after blowing up a great part of the bridge. The allies entered the old town of Dresden, April 26th. Kutusoff

having died on the 28th, the command-in-chief was conferred on Wittgenstein.

Napoleon arrived at Erfurt, April 25th, and assumed the command of his forces.[8] A campaign was now to open on a scale never before seen in Europe. The line of operations embraced the whole continent, from the Baltic to the Adriatic, besides the incidental war in the Spanish Peninsula. The French left rested on Lübeck and Hamburg; their right on Verona and Venice. This line may be divided into three portions: the first being comprised between Hamburg and the Erz-gebirge, at the southern extremity of Saxony; the second between the Erz-gebirge and the Tyrol, and the third between the Tyrol and the Adriatic. The first, or northernmost of these divisions, was to be the main scene of action, and was occupied by the grand French army, estimated at 250,000 men. A Bavarian corps on the Inn, and the French reserves at Würtzburg, held the second portion of the line; making a total force in Germany of about 350,000 men. In Italy, an army of 40,000 men was posted on the Tagliamento. Napoleon formed a junction with the army of Eugène on the 29th, between Naumburg and Merseburg on the Saale. Some Prussian corps were driven back at Weissenfels, and the French army took the road to Dresden. In order to intercept this march, the Russians and Prussians, under the Emperor Alexander and King Frederick William III. in person, had concentrated themselves at Leipsic, whence they marched out to meet the French on the plains of Lützen, famous for the last battle and death of Gustavus Adolphus. Napoleon was ignorant of their position, and came upon them almost by surprise. His forces were far superior in number, consisting of 115,000 men, while those of the allies were under 70,000. The latter were defeated after an obstinate and bloody battle at Gross Görschen,[9] May 2nd, which, however, was anything but decisive; in fact, both sides claimed the victory. The allies retreated, as they asserted, only on account of their numerical inferiority; they lost no guns nor prisoners, and retired in good order, unpursued by the enemy. This result was chiefly owing to Napoleon's deficiency in cavalry, while the allies were very strong in that arm. In this battle, General Scharnhorst was mortally wounded.

The allies retreating in two columns, crossed the Elbe, May 7th,

[8] For the campaign of 1813, see Clausewitz, B. vii.; K. von Plotho, *Der Krieg in Deutschland und Frankreich in den Jahren* 1813 *und* 1814; Odeleben, *Napoleons Feldzug in Sachsen im Jahre*, 1813; Norvins, *Portefeuille de* 1813; Fain, MS. de MDCCCXIII.

[9] The French call it the battle of Lützen.

the Russians at Dresden, the Prussians at Meissen, and again formed a junction at Bautzen. Here they took up a strong position, and having received large reinforcements, determined to await another battle. The French entered Dresden, May 8th, where Napoleon halted awhile to refresh his army, and to conduct some negociations. He caused an imperious letter to be written to the King of Saxony, by which that sovereign was required to direct General Thielmann, the Saxon commandant at Torgau, to deliver that fortress to the French, and to join the corps of General Regnier; also, to send all the Saxon cavalry to Dresden, and to declare in a letter to the Emperor that he still remained a member of the Confederation of the Rhine. Frederick Augustus was allowed only six hours to consider of these demands, when, if he did not comply, *he would be declared a traitor (félon), and would cease to reign.*[10] Such was the style in which Napoleon treated his tributary princes! Frederick Augustus obeyed the despot's mandate, and returned to his capital, May 12th. Napoleon declared that he would spare Saxony; but it became, in fact, the chief theatre of the war, and during six months had to support near half a million soldiers. Thielmann, who had refused to surrender Torgau at the summons of Napoleon, having received an order to that effect from his sovereign, abandoned the Saxon service for that of Russia.

Napoleon, during his sojourn at Dresden, also attempted a negociation with the Emperor Alexander. Alarmed at the attitude of Austria, as an armed mediator, he was prepared to make important sacrifices to Russia in order to come to an understanding with that Power; in which case his father-in-law would be at his mercy. His chief motive for this step was the want of cavalry, which hampered all his operations; otherwise, he observed, he should not have proposed an armistice. He sent to the allied outposts to inquire whether the Duke of Vicenza would be received as a negociator; but the application was refused, and it therefore became necessary to fight.

The allies had profited by Napoleon's delay of ten days at Dresden to strengthen their position at BAUTZEN with field-works. Their left, under Wittgenstein, rested on the mountains of Bohemia; their right, commanded by Blücher, was covered by the Spree and the little town of Bautzen. Their whole army, which Alexander commanded in person, numbered 96,000 men, of which 68,000 were Russians. The French army consisted of about 148,000 men. Napoleon attacked the allies, May 20th and 21st.

[10] Garden, t. xiv. p. 393 sq.

On the first day the French carried the town of Bautzen; on the next day Napoleon broke the allied centre, and compelled them to retreat. A movement of Ney's contributed much to the victory. He had been detached with a strong corps, apparently against Berlin, but suddenly retraced his steps, and fell upon the right of the allies. Covered by their numerous cavalry, the allies retired in good order towards Lauban and Görlitz, leaving to Napoleon the field of battle, strewn with 50,000 bodies. The French attacked the Russian rear-guard at Reichenbach, May 22nd, but were terribly maltreated, and lost several guns. A few days after, Wittgenstein was superseded in the chief command by Barclay de Tolly. The allies, instead of proceeding to Breslau, struck to the right towards Schweidnitz, and formed an entrenched camp at Pulzen, May 29th. Napoleon, on the other hand, pushed on to Breslau, which he entered June 1st; an advance which somewhat endangered his base of operations. In the north of Germany, the French and Danes under Davoust recovered Hamburg, May 30th, and took a terrible vengeance for their expulsion, by driving out 48,000 of the inhabitants and razing 8000 houses. In conformity with the orders of Napoleon, a regular reign of terror was now inaugurated, combined with systematic pillage, including that of the bank. Lübeck, which was entered by the French, June 3rd, was treated in the same manner.

After the battle of Bautzen, Napoleon renewed the attempt at negociation, and an armistice was concluded at the village of Poischwitz, near Jauer, June 4th. The armistice was to last till July 20th, with six days' notice of its termination. Napoleon now returned to Dresden and employed the interval in preparing the plan of the ensuing campaign, which was calculated on the no longer doubtful accession of Austria to the allies. England took an active part in organising the *Fifth Coalition*. Lord Cathcart, the English ambassador to the Court of St. Petersburg, and Sir Charles Stuart, brother of Lord Castlereagh, accredited to the Court of Berlin, both which ministers followed the movements of the allied armies, concluded treaties with Russia and Prussia at Reichenbach. By that with Prussia, signed June 14th, Great Britain agreed to pay a subsidy of 666,666*l.* sterling for the maintenance of 80,000 men during the remaining six months of the year. If the allied arms should prove successful, the King of Prussia was to be reinstated in the dominions which he had possessed before the war of 1806. Frederick William III. on his side engaged to cede the bishopric of Hildesheim and some other territories to Hanover. By the Treaty with Russia, June 15th, the Emperor Alexander

agreed to keep in the field an army of 160,000 men, for which he was to receive from the British Government the sum of 1,333,334*l.* to January 1st 1814. It was also agreed to issue five million sterling in notes, called *federate money*, guaranteed by Great Britain, Russia, and Prussia, of which Russia was to dispose of two-thirds, and Prussia of the remainder.[11] At this time, while Austria was offering her mediation for the restoration of a continental peace, she was negociating with the allies; and the Austrian plenipotentiaries were consulted about the plan of the future campaign.

These negociations were to be kept secret; but Napoleon learned them all, and in a violent scene with Count Metternich, whom the Cabinet of Vienna had sent to Dresden to propose a peace congress, he accused that minister of receiving bribes from England. It was, however, agreed that a congress should assemble at Prague, July 5th, under Austrian mediation, and the armistice was prolonged to August 10th. None of the parties, however, were in earnest in this matter; they were only seeking to gain time. The Congress did not assemble till July 26th, when only a fortnight remained unexpired of the term agreed upon for the armistice. Meanwhile Russia, Austria, and Prussia had concluded an eventual treaty of alliance at Trachenberg, afterwards converted into a definitive one by the Treaty of Töplitz, September 9th,[12] had arranged a plan of campaign, and appointed Prince Schwarzenberg commander-in-chief. During this period Napoleon, on his side, concluded a treaty of alliance with Denmark, July 10th.[13]

Many symptoms seemed to betoken Napoleon's approaching fall. Discontent prevailed in France, where the legitimists were again active; Jourdan had been completely defeated by Wellington at Vittoria; the King of Naples was treacherously negociating with Austria and England. Nevertheless, though Napoleon was aware of Murat's conduct, he was again summoned to take the command of the French cavalry. That force had now been increased to 40,000 men, and Napoleon relied only on Murat for the command of large bodies of horse. The allied armies, since the junction of Austria, were much superior in number to the French. Their main body, under Prince Schwarzenberg, stationed on the Eger in Bohemia, and composed of Austrians, Russians, and Prussians, comprised about 237,000 men, with 698 guns. The army in the March of Brandenburg, composed of Swedes, Russians, and Prussians, and commanded by Bernadotte, numbered upwards of

[11] Koch et Schöll, t. x. p. 254 sq.
[12] Martens, *N. Rec.*, pp. 596, 600.
[13] Garden, t. xiv. p. 412.

150,000 men with 387 guns. Blücher's army in Silesia consisted of about 95,000 Prussians and Russians, with 356 guns. It must be remembered, however, that a considerable part of these forces was engaged in blockades and sieges. The Austrians had besides upwards of 24,000 men and 42 guns on the frontiers of Bavaria; 50,000 men and 120 guns in Italy; and a reserve of about 50,000 men between Vienna and Presburg. The Russian army of reserve in Poland numbered more than 57,000 men. The estimates of Napoleon's armies vary, but there can be no doubt that they were considerably inferior in number to those of the allies. He himself, however, has been reckoned as equivalent to 100,000 men.

Napoleon opened the campaign by despatching Oudinot with 80,000 men against Bernadotte in Brandenburg. On August 23rd, Oudinot, who had been rather too slow in his movements, engaged Bulow's Prussian corps at Gross Beeren; when, towards the end of the action, the Swedes came up, and the French were entirely defeated with the loss of 26 guns, 1500 prisoners, and a great deal of baggage. Napoleon himself marched against Blücher in Silesia, imagining that he could dispose of that general before attacking the main body of the allies. As the French had violated the armistice by levying contributions in neutral districts, Blücher had also advanced before the term agreed upon had expired, had occupied Breslau August 14th, and driven the French over the Bober. According to a preconcerted plan, Blücher retreated on the approach of Napoleon with his guards; and as the main body of the allies had begun to debouch from Bohemia into Saxony by the left bank of the Elbe, Napoleon was compelled to hasten back to the defence of Dresden. No sooner was he gone than Blücher attacked the French under Macdonald on the Katzbach, August 26th, and gained a decisive victory, capturing 18,000 prisoners, 103 guns, 2 eagles, and a great quantity of baggage wagons.

The advance of the allied army upon Dresden is said to have been counselled by Moreau, who had arrived at the headquarters at Prague August 16th. The van of the allies arrived before that city on the 25th. Had an assault been immediately delivered it might probably have succeeded, as Napoleon was still absent with his best troops. But it was deemed advisable to wait till more troops had come up, and meanwhile Napoleon re-entered Dresden on the morning of the 26th, having, it is said, marched more than eighty miles in three days. The attack of the allies was repulsed, and next day they were defeated with great loss, including 18,000 prisoners. In this battle Moreau was killed by a cannon-ball, on the heights, about two miles from the town. Murat and Van-

damme followed the allies in their retreat to Bohemia, which was effected in good order, being covered by the Russian general Ostermann. Vandamme, relying on being supported by Napoleon, prolonged his pursuit too far. Ostermann, who had been reinforced by an Austrian corps, defeated him at Kulm, August 30th, when, instead of the expected aid, he found a Prussian corps in his rear. At Nollendorf, his division, which consisted of about 30,000 men, was entirely surrounded and routed, and two thirds of it either killed or captured. Among the prisoners was Vandamme himself.

In the north, Ney, who had assumed the command of Oudinot's division, began from Wittemberg a march upon Berlin, September 5th, but was defeated at Dennewitz the following day by Bernadotte. The French lost on the 6th and 7th 15,000 men killed, wounded, and captured, 80 guns, and 400 baggage wagons. In spite of these reverses, Napoleon continued to maintain his position at Dresden till October, making occasional attacks in the direction either of Bohemia or Silesia. But his situation began to be highly critical. His German troops were deserting his standards by whole regiments. Maximilian I. of Bavaria joined the allies October 1st by the Treaty of Ried: [14] a secession caused not by Maximilian's own feelings, but by the demonstrations of his subjects. By this treaty he agreed to give up the Tyrol; but he was to be indemnified at the future pacification for what cessions he might be called upon to make. He was to keep 36,000 men in the field. The Bavarian general Wrede, reinforced with an Austrian corps of 20,000 men, now marched towards the Rhine. In the north, the allies had got into Napoleon's rear. Tschernitscheff, Tettenborn, Platoff and other generals made incursions as far as Cassel and Bremen, fell upon isolated French corps, and compelled the King of Westphalia to fly to Wetzlar. Towards the end of September, the three main armies of the allies began to concentrate themselves towards Leipsic, and it became necessary for Napoleon to evacuate Dresden.

On the 15th of October Napoleon had assembled the greater part of his army at Leipsic, fixing his headquarters at Reudnitz, a mile or two from the city. He had now determined to risk all on a grand battle. His army consisted of about 170,000 men; that of the allies, upwards of 300,000 strong, formed a sort of half circle round him. From these enormous masses, the Germans have called the battle of LEIPSIC the *Völkerschlacht*, or battle of the nations. The Emperors Alexander and Francis, and the King

[14] Koch et Schöll, t. x. p. 294 sqq.

of Prussia, were present with their armies; of which Prince Schwarzenberg had the command in chief. Two or three distinct battles which took place October 16th, formed a prelude to the grand battle of the 18th. The French had, on the whole, the superiority in these affairs; but Blücher inflicted a severe defeat at Möckern on the corps of Marmont and Dombrowsky. On the evening of the 16th Napoleon despatched General Meerfeld to the Emperor of Austria, with proposals for a truce and separate negociations, which however were not accepted. On the 17th both sides rested on their arms, but the combat was renewed on the following day. At an early period of the action, Napoleon was deserted by the Saxon troops, as well as by those of Würtemberg. Nevertheless, the French succeeded in maintaining themselves through the whole of the 18th against far superior numbers; but their losses had been so numerous that they were compelled to commence a retreat in the night. Napoleon, after giving the necessary commands for that purpose, set off for Erfurt. The confusion of the retreat was augmented by the carelessness of Berthier, who had neglected to throw bridges over the Elster. Of the two that existed one broke down; and the whole army had, consequently, but a single route. On the morning of the 19th, Macdonald, Regnier, Poniatowski, and Lauriston kept the enemy at bay till the greater part of the French army had passed the bridge, when the French themselves destroyed it, thus sacrificing a few corps still left behind. Of these troops many perished in endeavouring to cross the Elster; Macdonald swam that river, Poniatowski was drowned in the attempt, Regnier and Lauriston were taken prisoners. The allies also suffered severely. They lost upwards of 45,000 men killed or wounded, including twenty-one general officers. The French loss is not accurately known; but 23,000 sick and wounded were found in the town of Leipsic alone; 15,000 were taken prisoners, 300 guns, and 900 baggage wagons were captured. When the Allies entered Leipsic the King of Saxony, who was in that town, expressed a wish to join them; but he was sent a prisoner to Berlin.

The French army was saved from total destruction through Napoleon having taken the precaution to send forward Bertrand to occupy Weissenfels. It still counted 100,000 men, but in a state of disorganisation. Napoleon remained two days at Erfurt, endeavouring in vain to rally his troops. The retreat was then resumed towards the Rhine, almost as disastrously as the retreat from Moscow, with the exception of the frost. Wrede, unmindful of the well-known maxim, attempted, with inferior forces, to arrest

the French at Hanau, but was defeated with great loss October 30th and 31st. The French reached and crossed the Rhine without further molestation. Schwarzenberg wished to pursue them over that river; but the allied sovereigns adopted a policy of moderation. By their celebrated Declaration of Frankfort,[15] December 1st, they announced their wish to see France great, powerful, and happy, because she was one of the corner stones of the European system; and they expressed their willingness that she should enjoy an extent of territory unknown under her kings. Proposals for a peace had been made to Napoleon through St. Aignan, who had been captured at Gotha, on the basis of the independence of Spain, Italy, Germany, and Holland: on the other hand, France was to retain possession of Belgium and the left bank of the Rhine. Napoleon had at first given an evasive answer to these proposals; and when at last, on the 2nd of December, by the advice of Caulaincourt (Duke of Vicenza), who had superseded Maret (Duke of Bassano), as Minister for Foreign Affairs, he announced his acceptance of them, and agreed to the opening of a Congress at Mannheim, the Allies had already adopted the resolution of prosecuting the war.

More than 100,000 French troops still remained in the fortresses of Germany and Poland. All these gradually surrendered, but mostly after a vigorous resistance. Gouvion St. Cyr, whom Napoleon had left in Dresden with 35,000 men, capitulated November 11th, on condition of a free and unmolested retreat. The Allied Sovereigns, however, refused to ratify the capitulation, on the ground that the besieging general was not authorised to make it, and St. Cyr was allowed the option either to surrender as prisoner of war, or to return to Dresden and attempt the defence of that city. The latter alternative being impossible, St. Cyr was obliged to accept the former. Stettin, Dantzic, Zamosk, Modlin, and Torgau surrendered before the end of the year. Some places held out till the spring of the following year, especially the citadels of Erfurt and Würtzburg; whilst Davoust maintained himself in Hamburg till after the Peace of Paris (May 30th).

The fall of Napoleon's empire in Germany was the immediate consequence of his defeat. Holland, with the exception of a few places, was occupied by the divisions of Bulow and Winzengerode, assisted by English troops who had landed on the coast. The Dutch were anxious to throw off the yoke of their oppressors; the cry of *Orange-boven* (up with Orange) was everywhere raised, and on December 1st the son of the former Stadtholder, was proclaimed

[15] In Koch et Schöll, t. x. p. 370 sq.

Sovereign Prince of the Netherlands, with the title of William I.[16] Towards the end of October, Jérome Bonaparte abandoned his kingdom of Westphalia, and in November the Elector of Hesse returned to his capital. Hanover, Oldenburg, Brunswick, were reoccupied by their respective sovereigns before the end of 1813. The princes of the Confederation of the Rhine, with the exception of the captive King of Saxony, and one or two minor princes, deserted Napoleon, and entered into treaties with the Allies. The Danes, having been driven out of Holstein by Bernadotte, concluded an armistice December 18th, and, finally, the PEACE OF KIEL,[17] January 14th 1814, by which Frederick VI. ceded Norway to Sweden; reserving, however, Greenland, the Ferroe Isles, and Iceland, which were regarded as dependencies of Norway. Norway, which was anciently governed by its own kings, had remained united with Denmark ever since the death of Olaf V. in 1387. Charles XIII., on his side, ceded to Denmark Swedish Pomerania and the Isle of Rügen. This treaty founded the present system of the North. Sweden withdrew entirely from her connection with Germany, and became a purely Scandinavian Power. The Norwegians, who detested the Swedes, made an attempt to assert their independence under the conduct of Prince Christian Frederick, cousin-german and heir of Frederick VI. of Denmark. Christian Frederick was proclaimed King of Norway; but the movement was opposed by Great Britain and the Allied Powers from considerations of policy rather than justice; and the Norwegians found themselves compelled to decree the union of Norway and Sweden in a *storting*, or Diet, assembled at Christiania, November 4th 1814.[18] Frederick VI. also signed a peace with Great Britain at Kiel, January 14th 1814.[19] All the Danish colonies, except Heligoland, which had been taken by the English, were restored. As by the treaty with Sweden, Denmark had consented to enter into the Coalition against Napoleon, Great Britain by this treaty agreed to pay a subsidy of 33,333*l.* per month, for a body of 10,000 troops which she was to furnish. Frederick VI. subsequently concluded a peace with Russia and Prussia.

In Italy, the war had also proved unfavourable to the French. Prince Eugène Beauharnais had returned into Italy in August 1813, when some battles occurred in the Illyrian provinces between him and the Austrian general Hiller. Eugène was driven back

[16] Schöll, *Recueil de Pièces officielles*, t. iv. p. 272.
[17] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. i. p. 666.
[18] *Ibid.* t. ii. p. 65. Also, *Act of the Diet of Norway and Sweden*, Aug. 6th 1815, *Ibid.* p. 608.
[19] *Ibid.* t. i. p. 678.

over the Isonzo to the Adige; the Illyrian and Dalmatian provinces were recovered by the Austrians; and as, by the defection of Bavaria from Napoleon, the Tyrol was opened to the Austrian troops, Eugène was finally compelled to retire behind the Mincio. After the battle of Leipsic, the Allies entered into negociations both with Eugène and the King of Naples. Murat, deeming Napoleon irretrievably ruined, had finally separated from his brother-in-law at Erfurth, October 24th, and returned to Naples. The Allies held out to him the prospect of extending his dominions to the Po, while Eugène was promised the crown of Lombardy. The Viceroy, however, remained faithful to his step-father, perhaps from mistrust that the Austrians would perform their promises, or the Italians endure his rule. Murat, on the other hand, swallowed the bait, and concluded a treaty with Austria, January 11th 1814,[20] by which he agreed to take part in the war against Napoleon. He also entered into a treaty with England, or rather with Lord Bentinck, who ruled absolutely in Sicily, but who had no powers to conclude this negociation. Murat had proceeded to take possession of Rome and Florence, under pretence that he was still the ally of France; and it was not until February 15th 1814, that he formally declared war against Napoleon.

In order to complete the picture of Napoleon's situation at the commencement of 1814, we must bring up to that date the affairs of the Spanish Peninsula. After his disastrous retreat from Moscow, Napoleon found himself compelled to withdraw some of his best troops from Spain; Marshal Soult was also recalled, and his place supplied by Jourdan. Wellington had employed himself in his winter quarters at Ciudad Rodrigo,[21] in putting his forces on a good footing, and preparing for a grand campaign. In the spring of 1813 he counted under his standards 80,000 men, more than half of whom were English. In May he assumed the offensive by marching on Salamanca, when the French retired on VITTORIA. The decisive victory gained by Lord Wellington over Jourdan in the neighbourhood of that city, June 21st, may be said to have decided the fate of the Peninsula. The French loss in killed, wounded, and prisoners has been variously estimated, but was certainly very great; they lost 151 guns, forming all their artillery, more than 400 wagons, and their military chest. As the direct road to France was held by the Spaniards, the routed army was compelled to retreat on Pampeluna. Joseph Bonaparte, who was present at the battle, saved himself with difficulty, and retired into France, abandoning all further hope of the Spanish

[20] Martens, *N. Rcc.*, t. i. p. 660. [21] Above, p. 501.

crown, of which, indeed, he was totally unworthy. Of low manners, without genius or talent, he had lived at Madrid in those habits of apathetic idleness and luxury which he had contracted at Naples. In the imperials of his carriages which were captured, were found some of the finest pictures taken from the royal palaces of Spain.[22] The failure of an expedition to Catalonia under the command of Sir John Murray, undertaken with the view of diverting Marshal Suchet from joining the French army of the centre, prevented Wellington from deriving all the benefit which he might have expected from his victory. Before he could enter France it was necessary to reduce the important places of Pampeluna and St. Sebastian. The former was blockaded by General Hill, the latter by General Graham, after the failure of an assault, July 26th, which cost 2000 men. Towards the end of July, Soult, who had entered Spain with a reinforcement of 20,000 men, and superseded Jourdan in the command of the French army, was compelled, after some bloody engagements, to re-enter France before the end of August. St. Sebastian surrendered September 9th, Pampeluna, October 29th. The left wing of Wellington's army had crossed the Bidassoa on the 7th. Soult had taken up a strong position on the Nivelle, which was attacked by Wellington, November 7th; on the 10th, St. Jean de Luz, the key of the position, was taken by storm, and Soult compelled to retire behind the Nive and the Adour. From this position, also, the French were driven after several days of hard fighting (December 8th-13th), and Soult then established a fortified camp at Bayonne. This town was invested by the Anglo-Portuguese army, and for some time hostilities seemed suspended. Thus, while the enemy threatened the Northern frontier of France, the South was actually invaded, and the despot who a year or two before seemed to behold all Europe at his feet, began to tremble for his own dominions.

Napoleon perceived soon after his return to Paris that it would be impossible for him to hold Spain, and that he must think of abandoning the phantom king whom he had set up. On November 12th 1813, he addressed a letter from St. Cloud to Ferdinand VII., at Valençay, who had been between five and six years his prisoner, offering to bring the affairs of Spain to a conclusion; and charged the bearer of it, Count Laforêt, to negociate a peace. Ferdinand having refused to treat without the sanction of the *de facto* Spanish Government,[23] it was agreed that a treaty

[22] Montgaillard, t. vii. p. 212.
[23] See for these letters, Koch et Schöll, t. x. p. 324 sqq.

should be drawn up and submitted to the Regency at Madrid, to be ratified by Ferdinand when approved. By this act, signed December 8th 1813,[24] Ferdinand was acknowledged by Napoleon as King of Spain and the Indies, and the integrity of Spain was recognised as it existed before the war. By the sixth article, evidently framed with the view of embroiling Spain with England, Ferdinand was to engage that the English should evacuate the Spanish territory, and especially Mahon and Ceuta. The Regency, however, refused to ratify the treaty, because the Cortès had decreed that there should be no negociations with France so long as the King remained a prisoner; and because, by the treaty with England, of January 14th 1809, Spain was to sign no peace with France without the consent of that country. But before this answer could arrive, Napoleon, whose situation was becoming every day more critical, informed the Spanish princes that they could return to their country without any conditions whatever. Ferdinand VII. arrived at Madrid before the end of March 1814. Pope Pius VII. had also been dismissed from his captivity, January 23rd, and on the 10th of March following the States of the Church were restored. We now return to the operations of the Allied army, and Napoleon's measures of defence.

The Emperor of the French had employed himself after his return to Paris in organising the means of resistance. By an Imperial decree of November 11th, he augmented several of the taxes in open violation of the fundamental laws of the Constitution. A *senatus-consulte* of the 15th placed at his disposal 300,000 conscripts of 1803 and following years to 1814 inclusive. Of these, half were to be immediately called into activity, while the remainder were to form an army of reserve. The legislative body had, however, like the Allies, taken courage from the misfortunes of Napoleon. The Report of a Commission appointed to examine the documents relative to the negociations with the Allies (December 28th 1813) ventured to breathe a hope that liberty, safety, property, and the exercise of political rights would be henceforth invariably maintained. The printing of this Report was voted by a large majority; but Napoleon regarding it as a crime against his authority, and a personal insult, forbade it to be published, and immediately adjourned the Legislature.

An extraordinary diet, assembled at Zürich, had proclaimed the neutrality of Switzerland, November 18th 1813; a cordon of troops was ordered to the frontiers, and deputies were sent both to the

[24] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. i. p. 654.

Allied Sovereigns and to Napoleon to engage them to respect Swiss neutrality. The French Emperor readily consented, and ordered his troops to evacuate Switzerland. But the Allies resolved not to recognise a neutrality which would essentially interfere with their operations, and which would be respected by Napoleon only so long as it suited his convenience. The grand army of Bohemia under Prince Schwarzenberg was directed to penetrate through Switzerland into Alsace and Franche Comté, and to march upon Paris, having first secured the important position of Langres. Another portion of it was to occupy the roads from Italy. The army of Silesia under Blücher was to pass the Rhine, above and below Mentz, and also to direct its march upon the capital, masking the fortresses on the road. Part of the army of the North under the Prince Royal of Sweden (Bernadotte) was also to act on the offensive in France; but a large part of it was employed to occupy Holland and Belgium. The Swedish army and the Duke of Brunswick's corps did not arrive in France till after the fall of Paris. Schwarzenberg established his headquarters at Langres, January 18th, where the three allied monarchs arrived a few days later. The army of Silesia having, after some fighting, crossed the Rhine and Saar, advanced by the 25th of January to Metz and Nancy, and was in communication with the grand army of Prince Schwarzenberg. Napoleon, who was assembling his forces at Châlons sur Marne, seems not to have expected that the Allies would so speedily pass the Rhine. He left Paris to join his army, January 25th 1814, after appointing his brother Joseph to the command of the National Guard.

The campaign which Napoleon now entered on is reckoned one of the ablest he ever conducted, He manœuvred with wonderful skill between Schwarzenberg and Blücher, arresting first the one then the other. But the transient successes which he achieved were perhaps of more detriment than service to him, as they hindered him from entering sincerely into the negociations which had been opened at Chatillon, February 5th, for a peace on the basis proposed at Frankfort. To this Congress Great Britain had sent Lords Castlereagh, Cathcart, and Aberdeen. As the allies had not yet determined on the restoration of the Bourbons, they consented to treat with Napoleon as the sovereign of France, but of France reduced within her natural limits, and no longer menacing the peace and independence of the rest of Europe. It soon, however, became apparent that Napoleon's good faith could not be relied on. His demands always rose with his success; and at last, on the 15th of March, his minister Coulaincourt handed in

such an extravagant counter-project as determined the allies to break up the conference. He demanded the kingdom of Italy, including Venice, for Eugène Beauharnais and his successors; Nimeguen and the line of the Waal for a French frontier, thus including the Netherlands and the Scheldt; also the left bank of the Rhine, and establishments for his brothers Joseph and Jerôme, and his nephew Louis, who were to renounce the thrones of Spain and Westphalia, and the grand duchy of Berg. While the allies were treating with Napoleon, they had drawn closer their bond of union by the Treaty of Chaumont, concluded March 1st 1814.[25] Each of the allies engaged to keep 150,000 men constantly in the field; and Great Britain engaged moreover to furnish a subsidy of 5 millions sterling for the service of the current year, to be divided equally among the other three Powers. The alliance was to last for twenty years. But to return to the campaign; of which, however, we can give but the bare outline.

Napoleon attacked Blücher in his position at Brienne January 29th, but was totally defeated February 1st. This engagement is sometimes also called the battle of La Rothière. It was now resolved that the two armies of the allies should advance separately on Paris; that of Blücher along the Marne, that of Schwarzenberg along the Seine. But Napoleon, again turning upon Blücher, inflicted on him several defeats at Champaubert, Montmirail, Etoges, &c. (Feb. 10th—14th), and compelled him to fall back in order to join the advancing army of the North under Bülow. Napoleon then marched against the army of Schwarzenberg, which had advanced to Fontainebleau, and which he defeated at Montereau, February 18th. Schwarzenberg then retreated to Troyes and Bar-sur-Aube. The fate of Europe seemed again to hang on a mere thread; the Austrians even made proposals for an armistice, which, however, had no result. Blücher having been joined by the army of the North, again advanced and defeated Napoleon in an obstinate battle at Laon, which lasted March 9th and 10th. In consequence of this victory, the two allied armies again advanced. Napoleon, leaving Marmont and Mortier to observe Blücher, marched with about 40,000 men against the grand army, which he attacked at Arcis-sur-Aube, March 20th, 21st, but with doubtful success. He now suddenly formed the resolution of marching on St. Dizier, in the rear of the allies, threatening the line of communication of the grand army, collecting the garrisons, making a levy *en masse* in Alsace and Lorraine, and saving

[25] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. i. p. 683.

Paris by carrying the war into Germany. The allies, having discovered his plan from an intercepted letter, determined not to follow him, but to advance on Paris by forced marches; at the same time despatching Winzingerode with 8000 men after Napoleon, to induce him to believe that he was followed by the whole army. Blücher now formed a junction with Schwarzenberg, after defeating Marmont and Mortier at La Fère Champenoise, March 25th. On the 29th the allies had reached Clichy and Villepinte; while Marmont and Mortier had retired on Paris after their defeat, and occupied the heights of Montmartre and Belleville. The Regent, Maria Louisa and her son, the King of Rome, now left Paris for Blois, agreeably to the directions of Napoleon two months before; while Joseph Bonaparte called out the National Guard, and prepared to defend the capital. On the 30th an obstinate conflict took place on the heights of Montmartre, Belleville, and Romainville, which was terminated by Marmont proposing an armistice; not, however, before Montmartre had been carried by Blücher. On the following day, March 31st, at two o'clock in the morning, was signed the Capitulation of Paris. Marmont and Mortier, with their troops, were to leave the city; the arsenals, magazines, &c. were to be left in the state in which they were; the National Guard was to be retained or dismissed, according to the decision of the allies, to whose magnanimity Paris was recommended.[26]

At eleven o'clock the Emperor of Russia and King of Prussia entered Paris at the head of 36,000 men, amidst the acclamations of the people. Many cries arose for the Bourbons, and the proscribed white cockade was everywhere displayed. In the afternoon a proclamation was published, signed by the Emperor Alexander, in which the allied sovereigns announced that they would no longer treat with Napoleon Bonaparte, or any of his family; that they would respect the integrity of France as it had existed under its ancient kings; that they would recognise and guarantee any constitution that the French nation might establish; and, consequently, they invited the Senate to appoint a provisional government to prepare such a constitution, and to conduct the administration. On the following day, April 1st, the Senate, which during ten years had worshipped Napoleon as their idol, pronounced his deposition and that of his family. But it went no further. The Council General of the Department of the Seine took the initiative in proclaiming the restoration of the Bourbons in the person of Louis XVIII.

[26] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. i. p. 693.

Meanwhile, Napoleon, who, imagining himself pursued by the allied army, had retired as far as Doulevant in the Haute Marne, returned suddenly upon St. Dizier, and defeated Winzingerode's advanced guard. On the following day, the 27th, he invested Vitry. Here he learned the march of the allies on Paris; a piece of intelligence which seems to have deprived him of his usual presence of mind. Instead of advancing on the capital, he retired through St. Dizier and Vassy, and again reached Doulevant March 28th, where he had been five days before. When he heard that the allies were approaching Paris, he despatched an order not to sacrifice that capital by an obstinate defence; and he sent an Austrian captive of distinction to the Emperor Francis at Dijon, to implore his commiseration in favour of the usurper's dynasty; but without effect. On the 29th of March Napoleon was informed that Lyon had surrendered to the allies, who had penetrated through Switzerland. He now advanced upon Troyes; whence, in contradiction to his former orders, he sent directions that Paris should be defended to the last extremity. He then proceeded by way of Sens to Fontainebleau and endeavoured to open negociations with Prince Schwarzenberg, by whom they were rejected. He had still a considerable army at Fontainebleau; but on the 4th of April, he was deserted by Marmont and his corps, who submitted to the authority of the Provisional Government. Napoleon hereupon published an order of the day in which, while he vented his rage against Marmont and the soldiers and government that had deserted him, he announced his readiness to remove, by his abdication, all obstacles to a peace; a resolution which was the result of a conference with his marshals, who had declared his abdication necessary. He now charged Ney, Macdonald, and Coulaincourt to carry to Paris an act of resignation in favour of his son, as well as a letter to the Emperor Alexander, in which he reminded that sovereign that he had been his friend. His marshals and generals hastened to give in their adherence to the Provisional Government, and all hostilities ceased. It was not, however, till the 10th of April that Napoleon signed an unconditional resignation of the crowns of France and Italy, both for himself and his heirs, after the Emperor Alexander and the French Provisional Government had assured to him a pension of 2,000,000 francs and an asylum in the Isle of Elba; of which he was to have the sovereignty, and to retain the title of Emperor. A formal Convention to this effect was signed April 11th.[27]

[27] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. i. p. 696.

Further resistance would indeed have been insane. Not only were Paris and the northern and eastern provinces of France in possession of the allies, but Wellington was also advancing in the south, and was everywhere received by the people as a deliverer. Wellington during the winter season had remained inactive before Bayonne till the middle of February, when he resumed the offensive, and after a few days' fighting drove the French from their position at that place. Soult retired to Orthez, where he was defeated, February 27th. Bayonne, St. Jean Pied de Port, Navarrein, were successively invested by the English. Soult, retreating by way of Tarbes, had concentrated his army at Toulouse. An English division, under Beresford, advanced to the Garonne, and entered Bordeaux March 12th, accompanied by the Duke d'Angoulême, nephew of Louis XVI., who had joined the English army some weeks before. Bordeaux now declared for the Bourbons and proclaimed Louis XVIII., although the Congress at Châtillon was still treating with Napoleon as Sovereign of France. Soult was attacked at Toulouse by Wellington, April 10th, and after an obstinate defence, which caused the assailants great loss, was compelled on the 12th to abandon his position. Neither the French nor the English general appears to have been aware that Napoleon had abdicated. After the defeat of Soult, the inhabitants of Toulouse immediately hoisted the Bourbon colours. So late as the night of April 14th, the garrison of Bayonne made a sortie which cost many lives on both sides; and it was not till the 18th that an armistice was signed between Wellington and Soult.

Napoleon lingered more than a week at Fontainebleau, as if loth to quit the scene of his former glory.[28] At last, on the 20th of April, after taking an affecting, though somewhat theatrical, leave of his guard, so long the companions of his varying fortunes, he set off for Fréjûs, and embarking on board a British frigate, landed at Porto Ferrajo, in Elba, May 4th. His brother Joseph had fled into Switzerland. His Empress, Maria Louisa, after a short stay at Rambouillet, proceeded to Vienna, and again became an Austrian princess. The Count d'Artois, brother of Louis XVIII., who had returned to Paris with the title and authority of lieutenant-general of the kingdom, signed with the allies a Convention, April 23rd,[29] with the view of affording France the benefits of peace before a regular treaty could be prepared. The allies agreed to evacuate the French territory, according to the ancient limits of it, on January 1st 1792. Thus vanished with

[28] He is said to have taken a dose of poison, which, however, failed of its intended effect.

[29] Koch et Schöll, t. x. p. 439.

the stroke of a pen the fruits of twenty years of bloodshed and conquest! France also surrendered by this treaty about fifty fortresses which she continued to occupy in Germany, Holland, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain, &c.

Louis XVIII., who had resided several years at Hartwell, in Buckinghamshire, entered Paris May 3rd. In this ceremony, the chief object of attraction was the Duchess of Angoulême, daughter of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette, who sat in the same carriage with her uncle. Louis XVIII. had published the day before at St. Ouen a declaration announcing his resolution to adopt a liberal constitution, though he rejected one proposed by the Senate, April 6th. The principal features of the new constitution were to be: a representative government, divided into two chambers; taxation by consent of the deputies; public and individual liberty; freedom of the press and of worship; inviolability of property; sales of national property not to be questioned; responsible ministers; irremovable judges; guarantee of the public debt; maintenance of the Legion of Honour; admissibility of every Frenchman to all employments; no individual to be molested regarding his opinions and his votes.[30] This proclamation is said to have been exacted from Louis by the Emperor of Russia. Louis wished to reseat himself unpledged and as an absolute sovereign on the throne of his ancestors, as if all that had happened since 1789 had been a mere dream; but Alexander, who is said to have corrected the proclamation with his own hand, threatened that Louis should not be admitted into his capital till he had signed it. Thus, the French were indebted for their charter to the absolute autocrat of the North! Talleyrand, who was chiefly instrumental in bridging over the chasm between the abdication of Napoleon and the restoration of the Bourbons, and who with the tenacious versatility which characterised him became again minister for foreign affairs under the new government, is said purposely to have delayed the conclusion of a treaty of peace till the project of the new constitution should have been arranged. Fearing that Louis, after the departure of the Emperor Alexander, might be inclined to neglect his engagements, a commission for drawing up a constitution was appointed May 18th, and on the 30th of the same month was signed the PEACE OF PARIS. A separate treaty was concluded with each of the four allied Powers, but all of the same tenour, except an additional article reserved by each Power.[31] The allies must be allowed to have displayed in this treaty great forbearance

[30] Montgaillard, t. viii. p. 13.

[31] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. ii. p. 1.

and moderation, when it is considered what losses and humiliations Napoleon had inflicted on at least three of their number. France was not only suffered to retain the limits of 1792, but some additions were even made to them by annexing certain districts of the Ardennes, the Moselle, the Lower Rhine, the Ain, as well as part of Savoy, and by confirming her possession of Avignon, the Venaissin and other places, comprising in the whole 150 square miles, with a population of near half a million souls. Holland was to be placed under the sovereignty of the House of Orange, and to receive an accession of territory. The States of Germany were to be independent, and united by a confederation; the revival of the German Empire being thus tacitly negatived. The independence of Switzerland was recognised. Italy, except the portion to be restored to Austria, was to be composed of sovereign states. Great Britain was to possess Malta and its dependencies; while on the other hand she engaged to restore to France all the colonies possessed by that country on the 1st of January 1792, except Tobago, St. Lucia, and the Isle of France; also that part of St. Domingo which had originally belonged to Spain, and which was now to be restored to that country. Sweden also was to cede back Guadeloupe to France, and Portugal, French Guiana. The 32nd Article of the treaty provided for the assembly of a General Congress at Vienna within two months, to regulate the arrangements that were to complete the present treaty.

The Peace of Paris was followed by some subsidiary treaties. Ferdinand VII. acceded to the peace July 20th. By a Convention of June 3rd between Austria and Bavaria, Maximilian Joseph restored to Austria the Tyrol with the Vorarlberg, the principality of Salzburg, the district of the Inn and the Hausrück. During the visit of the Emperor Alexander and the King of Prussia to London in June, it was agreed that the Article of the Peace of Paris stipulating the aggrandisement of Holland, should be carried out by the annexation of Belgium to that country, an arrangement which was accepted by the Sovereign of the Netherlands, July 21st 1814.[32] Great Britain, by a treaty concluded at London, August 13th 1814,[33] restored to that Sovereign all the colonies of which Holland had been in possession on January 1st 1803, except the Cape of Good Hope, Demerara, Essequibo, and Berbice. Part of these were intended to compensate Sweden for relinquishing Guadeloupe; but the Swedish Government preferring a payment in money, Great Britain purchased their claims for a million sterling. Great Britain also paid to the Sovereign of the Netherlands, in

[32] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. ii. p. 38. [33] *Ibid.* p. 57.

consideration of these colonies, a further sum of two millions sterling, to be employed in restoring the Belgian fortresses. These had been dismantled by the Emperor Joseph II., and the Netherlands consequently left without defence.

It remains to mention the affairs of Italy. Napoleon, on the news of Murat's defection, had directed Eugène Beauharnais to evacuate that country; an order with which the Viceroy neglected to comply, partly because he could not obtain honourable terms for the different garrisons, partly because he hoped that the Lombards would elect him for their King. On February 8th he delivered battle to Bellegarde at Valeggio, on the Mincio, which, though he gained the advantage, led to no results. Murat soon discovered how vain were his hopes of obtaining Italy as the reward of his defection. The Emperor Francis postponed the ratification of the treaty; Lord Bentinck received no power to conclude. General Nugent, who, with an Austrian corps, had been placed under Murat's command, took possession of Modena, not in the name of the King of Naples, but of the House of Este. Murat received, indeed, the ratified treaty from Vienna, March 8th, but considerably altered to his disadvantage, the only addition to his dominions being a small portion of the States of the Church; while Lord Bentinck, after the landing of a body of Anglo-Sicilian troops at Leghorn, openly gave out that they were designed to support the rights of the Bourbons to Naples. But as the Emperor of Russia seemed disposed to offer Murat his alliance, it was agreed that Lord Bentinck should evacuate Tuscany and march upon Genoa. With the aid of an English fleet, under Admiral Pellew, that city was reduced to capitulate, April 18th, and two days after the French garrison marched out with its arms and baggage, and took the road to Savona. On the 26th, Lord Bentinck, without the sanction of his Government, published a proclamation re-establishing the Genoese Constitution, such as it existed in 1797, with such modifications as public opinion might require. Pope Pius VII., who, as we have said, had been disarmed by Napoleon, entered Rome in a sort of triumph, May 24th, and Murat found himself compelled to acquiesce in the restoration of the Papal authority in the Roman States. Soon afterwards he was obliged to relinquish Tuscany to Ferdinand III.

After the abdication of Napoleon, Eugène Beauharnais was also compelled to lay down his arms. On April 16th he signed an armistice with Bellegarde at Schiarino-Rizzino, near Mantua, and the French troops in Lombardy marched homewards. Eugène, supported by a majority of the Senate, still hoped to be elected

King of Italy, and to persuade the allied Powers to recognise him in that capacity. But a strong Austrian party existed in Milan, which, taking advantage of the popular hatred of the French, excited an insurrection against the senators of Eugène's party, who were driven from the city, April 20th. By the Convention of Mantua, April 23rd,[34] Eugène agreed to evacuate all the fortresses of the Kingdom of Italy. General Bellegarde entered Milan April 28th, occupied the other Lombard cities, and proclaimed, May 23rd, that he took possession of the Kingdom of Italy in the name of his sovereign, Francis. Eugène now betook himself to his father-in-law, the King of Bavaria. The fate of Piedmont was determined at the same time. A proclamation of Prince Schwarzenberg, dated at Paris, April 25th, announced to the Piedmontese that Austrian troops would take possession of the country in the name of the King of Sardinia; and on the 27th the plenipotentiaries of Prince Camille Borghese, governor-general of the departments beyond the Alps, signed at Turin a Convention[35] for an armistice, and for the evacuation of those departments by the French troops.

After a quarter of a century disturbed by revolution and war, France and Europe seemed to be returning to peace and order. On June 4th 1814, Louis XVIII. gave a Charter to the French nation, as an emanation of his own absolute authority. To receive this boon the same legislature was assembled which Napoleon had dismissed in December 1813, in preference to calling upon the people to sanction it by newly-elected representatives. The chancellor, Dombray, even ventured to remark in his speech that the King, "in full possession of his hereditary rights, wishes only to exercise the authority which he holds from God and his forefathers in fixing himself the limits of his power."[36] The Charter was signed by Louis as given "in the 19th year of his reign," thus ignoring the republic, the consulate, and the empire. Its main features were that the legislature should consist of a chamber of peers and a chamber of deputies; the peers to be nominated by the crown, the deputies to be chosen by the people. The qualifications for a deputy were, to have completed forty years of age, and to pay annually 1000 francs in direct taxes. The qualifications for an elector were to have completed thirty years of age, and to contribute annually to the direct taxation 300 francs. The King only was to have the right of proposing laws. The Chambers, however, were entitled to suggest them; but if such

[34] Koch et Schöll, t. x. p. 478.
[35] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. i. p. 716.
[36] Montgaillard, t. viii. p. 29.

suggestion were disregarded, it could not be renewed during the same session. All forms of Christian worship were to be tolerated, but Roman Catholicism remained the religion of the State.

In order to settle the general affairs of Europe, it had been determined to assemble a Congress at Vienna, which was formally opened November 1st. At this Congress were present, in person, the Emperors of Austria and Russia, the Kings of Prussia, Denmark, Bavaria, and Würtemberg, the Elector of Hesse, the Grand Duke of Baden, the Dukes of Saxe-Weimar, Brunswick, Coburg, and many other German Princes. The other European States were represented by their ambassadors and ministers, among whom we may mention Lord Castlereagh and the Duke of Wellington, for England; Prince Talleyrand and the Duke of Dalberg for France, Don Labrador for Spain, Count Palmella and Don Lobo da Silveyra for Portugal, Cardinal Gonsalvi for the Pope. We can give but the main outlines of the transactions of the Congress.[37] The chief subjects of debate were Italy, the Netherlands, Poland, and Germany.

The affairs of Italy, in which Austria was the Power chiefly interested, did not occasion much discussion. Austria recovered Lombardy and the Venetian territories, except the Ionian Isles, which were erected into a republic, under the protection of Great Britain. Tuscany and Modena also fell to collateral branches of the House of Austria, the first to the Archduke Ferdinand, the second to the Archduke François d'Este, also a Prince of the House of Habsburg-Lorraine. Parma, Piacenza, and Guastalla were given to Napoleon's consort, Maria Louisa, with the title of "Empress." Lucca, erected into a duchy, was assigned to the ex-Queen of Etruria. The Pope recovered the Legations, Benevento and Ponte Corvo. The King of Sardinia, Victor Emanuel, recovered Piedmont and Savoy, with the addition of Genoa, the English Government having ignored Lord Bentinck's proclamation. Joachim Murat, agreeably to treaties, was left for the present in possession of Naples, which he was soon to lose by his own act. Holland and Belgium were erected into the Kingdom of the Netherlands, in favour of the Prince of Orange, with the title of William I.; though warning voices already proclaimed the danger of uniting two countries so different in language, customs, and religion.

[37] The principal works on this subject are, Klüber, *Acten des Wiener Congresses*, 7 vols. 8vo.; and by the same, in French, *Congrès de Vienne, Recueil de Pièces officielles*, &c., being an extract of the principal pieces of the former work. An analysis of them is given in Koch et Schöll, *Hist. des Traités*, t. xi. Also, Bucholz, *Gesch. der Europäischen Staaten seit dem Frieden von Wien*, B. v.; Flassan, *Hist. du Congrès de Vienne*; De Pradt, *Du Congrès de Vienne*.

In Germany, the Kingdom of Westphalia had fallen of itself, and the former sovereigns who claimed its various parts had recovered their possessions. On this occasion the King of England assumed the title of "King," instead of "Elector" of Hanover. The re-establishment of the German Empire was discussed. Several of the German princes and cities were for its revival; but the scheme was not approved by the allies, nor by the Emperor of Austria. A federative constitution was established for Germany, with a diet to be held at Frankfort. The Kings of Denmark and the Netherlands were to be members of the Confederation; the former by virtue of his Duchy of Holstein, the latter for Luxembourg. Bavaria received for her restorations to Austria her former Palatine possessions, with Würtzburg, Aschaffenburg, and what is called Rhenish Bavaria. The restoration of the Prussian Kingdom occasioned long and violent debates, principally from the circumstance of the erection of the Duchy of Warsaw and the Emperor of Russia's promise to restore the Kingdom of Poland under his protectorate. Prussia demanded, in compensation, the whole of Saxony, and was supported by Russia; while she was opposed by Austria, France, and England. A new European war seemed on the point of breaking out, which was averted by concessions on both sides. The Emperor Alexander abandoned the Duchy of Posen to Prussia, and to Austria the salt works of Wieliczka and the part of Galicia which she had lost in the last war. The city of Cracow, with a territory of 19½ square geographical miles, was recognised as an independent republic. Besides the Duchy of Posen, Prussia was further compensated with about a third part of Saxony and her present Rhenish provinces.

While the Congress was thus restoring Europe to its ancient system, an event occurred which threatened to upset all their labours and to replunge the Continent into confusion. Napoleon, escaping from Elba with 900 of his veterans, landed near Cannes, March 1st 1815. The news of this event fell like a thunderbolt among the statesmen assembled at Vienna. It had the effect of silencing all minor disputes and uniting the four Powers against the common enemy. On March 13th they published a declaration of outlawry against him; and soon after they renewed the alliance of Chaumont, by a fresh treaty, signed at Vienna March 25th.[38] By Article 8., Louis XVIII. was to be invited to accede to it. But as before the ratification of it, April 25th, Napoleon seemed to have firmly reseated himself upon the throne, the British

[38] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. ii. p. 110 sqq.

Government handed in a declaration purporting that Article 8. was not to be taken as obliging the King of England to prosecute the war for the sake of imposing any particular government upon France; and the Austrian, Prussian, and Russian ministers acceded to this declaration.[39] Great Britain concluded an additional Convention, April 30th,[40] agreeing to furnish a subsidy of five millions, to be equally divided between Austria, Russia, and Prussia. Most of the European States successively acceded to the alliance. The amount of the contingents which they engaged to provide considerably exceeded a million men.

Meanwhile, as Napoleon marched towards Paris he was everywhere joined by the soldiery. At Lyon, where he arrived March 12th, he published several decrees, by one of which he proclaimed a general amnesty, excepting however thirteen persons. Among these were Talleyrand, Marmont, the Duke d'Alberg, and Bourrienne, his former secretary. By another decree he promised to convoke a *Champ de Mai*, or assembly of the people, to settle the constitution on the most liberal basis; and to inspire the French with the belief that his return was concerted with Austria, it was added that the Empress and her son were to be crowned in the presence of this assembly. Marshal Ney, who less than a year before had been one of the first to welcome Louis XVIII. at Compiègne on his return to France, volunteered his services to march against and capture Napoleon; but a few words from his old commander turned his heart, and he joined at Auxerre Napoleon's standards. In fact the battalions despatched against the Emperor served only to augment his escort. Louis XVIII. found himself compelled to fly from Paris, March 20th; on the evening of the same day Napoleon entered that capital, and was again installed at the Tuileries amid the exulting congratulations of his former followers and admirers. Louis proceeded to Lille and afterwards to Ghent, where he remained during the whole of what is called the HUNDRED DAYS, the term of Napoleon's second empire. The Duke of Bourbon failed in an attempt to excite an insurrection in La Vendée. He even fell into the power of the ex-emperor, who had murdered his son; but Napoleon recoiled from a second political crime of that description, and gave orders that the Duke should be furnished with a passport for England. The Duchess of Angoulême, relying on the loyalty displayed by the city of Bordeaux in the previous year, also made a spirited attempt to maintain the Bourbon cause in the south of France;

[39] Martens, *N. Rec.*, t. ii. p. 117. [40] *Ibid.* p. 121 sq.

but the population of Bordeaux declined to second her on this occasion, and the Princess also found herself compelled to seek a refuge in England.[41]

Napoleon, though his enterprise had been crowned with such sudden and complete success, found himself in a situation of no ordinary difficulty. The treasury was empty, the army weakened and disorganised, the patriot party, if by such a term we may designate the opponents of the Bourbons, mistrustful and exacting. Napoleon named as his ministers, Cambacérès for the department of Justice, Carnot for the Interior, Fouché for the Police, Coulaincourt (Duke of Vicenza) for Foreign Affairs. On April 22nd, Napoleon promulgated what he called "an additional Act" to the constitutions of the Empire. It was a good deal modelled on the Charter of Louis XVIII., but far outstripped it in the liberality of its concessions.

It was, however, on the fortune of war that his hold of power must depend. If he could maintain himself against the attacks of the allies, there was little danger of his being hurled from the throne by his French subjects. The *Champ de Mai*, held June 1st, was celebrated with enthusiasm, and served to rally the people in Napoleon's defence. His disposable army at this time numbered 200,000 men, besides the troops in garrison and a reserve of 150,000 recruits. In accordance with his usual tactics, he resolved to take the offensive and to strike a blow before the allies should be fully prepared. Hostilities had been already resumed in Italy. No sooner did Murat hear of the enthusiasm with which Napoleon had been received in France than he entered the Papal States with two armies, March 22nd, and marched to encounter the Austrians in Northern Italy. He still harboured the dream of being King of all Italy, and called upon the Italians to drive out the foreigners and found a united kingdom. He occupied Tuscany, Bologna, and Modena, and arrived upon the banks of the Po without having experienced any serious resistance. But on May 3rd he was attacked by the Austrians, under Bianchi, at Tolentino, and after a combat of two days was completely defeated. The Austrians now pressed on to Naples. Before Murat could arrive there his consort had concluded a convention with Commodore Campbell, the commander of the English fleet, by which the safety of Naples was secured, but on condition of the surrender of all the Neapolitan ships of war. By the Convention of Casa Lanzi between the Austrian generals and the English

[41] Montgaillard, t. viii. p. 153.

minister on one part, and the commander-in-chief of the Neapolitan army on the other, May 20th, the Kingdom of Naples, with all its ports, fortresses, and arsenals, was to be delivered up to the Allies, in order to be restored to King Ferdinand IV.; agreeably to a treaty between that sovereign and the Emperor of Austria, concluded at Vienna, April 29th.[42] Murat fled to the Isle of Ischia and subsequently to France; but Napoleon forbade him to appear at Paris. His consort obtained permission to reside in the Austrian dominions. Ferdinand IV., after ten years' residence in Sicily, returned to Naples, June 17th.

According to the plan of campaign agreed upon by the allies,[43] the English and Prussians were to enter France from the Netherlands, whilst the Austrians were to penetrate from the Rhine. The English and Prussian armies, under Wellington and Blücher, comprising 220,000 men, already stood upon the Belgian frontiers; and Napoleon determined to attack them before the Austrians and Prussians could come up. All the troops he could spare for that purpose were 130,000 men, while to oppose the Austrians he could despatch only 30,000 men. Napoleon left Paris for Belgium, June 12th. At this time the Russian army, which equalled in number those of Wellington and Blücher, was only about eight days' march from the scene of action. Wellington's army, composed of English, Hanoverians, Brunswickers, and Netherlanders, extended from the sea to the Dyle. Blücher's army, divided into four corps of from 25,000 to 30,000 men, stretched along the Meuse, from the Dyle to the frontiers of Luxembourg. Napoleon resorted to his old strategy of attacking one army after the other, and endeavouring to separate Wellington and Blücher. On June 15th, the French crossed the Sambre, defeated Zieten, took Charleroi, and compelled the advanced guard of the Prussians to retire to Ligny and St. Amand. Blücher now ordered his second corps to advance to Sombreuf, five or six miles north of Fleurus; while Wellington, on hearing what had occurred, ordered his troops to advance on the following morning (16th) to Nivelles and Quatre Bras. He had arranged to send 20,000 men to the aid of Blücher, but being himself attacked by Marshal Ney at Quatre Bras, he was unable to perform this promise, though he succeeded in repulsing Ney and in maintaining his position. In this action the Duke of Brunswick was slain. Blücher, attacked by Napoleon

[42] Koch et Schöll, t. xi. p. 201 sqq.

[43] For this campaign, see C. de W. (Weiss) (Baron Müffling), *Hist. de la Campagne, &c. en* 1815; Buchholz, *Gesch. der ver. Staaten*, B. vi.; Plotho, *Krieg der verbundeten Europa gegen Frankreich im Jahre* 1815.

in person with superior forces at Ligny, was defeated with great loss, and compelled to retreat to Wavre, in order to put himself in communication with his fourth corps under Bülow, which had not come up on the 16th. Wellington, hearing of this retrograde movement on the morning of the 17th, also retired through Gemappes to Waterloo, in order to maintain his communication with the Prussians. Napoleon despatched Grouchy with between 30,000 and 40,000 men to attack the Prussians at Wavre, with orders, after defeating them, to turn against Wellington's army. Napoleon himself attacked Wellington on the 18th. The British army was posted on the heights of Mont St. Jean, with the strong positions in front of Hougoumont and La Haye Sainte. The French, after a desperate struggle, succeeded in carrying the latter position; and also in making a lodgment at Hougoumont, after that post had been two or three times lost and won. But an attack executed by the guard and the *élite* of the French army on the British lines towards the close of the day was repulsed, and the French thrown into utter confusion. Grouchy, engaging at Wavre a Prussian corps, which he mistook for their whole army, was too long detained to make his appearance on the 18th. But Bülow's Prussian corps came up towards the close of the day, and beginning to operate on the right flank of the French, completed their defeat. Blücher appeared soon after with the main body of the Prussians, and he and Wellington, meeting at La Belle Alliance, which had been the centre of the French position, saluted each other as victors.

The retreat of the French soon became a perfect rout. They are said to have lost 60,000 men during the three days' struggle in killed, wounded, and prisoners. Their pursuit was abandoned to the Prussians, who were comparatively fresh. Napoleon, relinquishing to Soult the command of the defeated army, hastened back to Paris, where he arrived June 21st. His carriage, filled with gold and precious stones, his Imperial mantle, and his portfolio, formed part of the booty of the victors. The Chamber of Deputies had displayed symptoms of resistance to Napoleon's despotism; who, at the instigation of his brother Lucien and other partisans, determined to dissolve it, and assume a dictatorial authority. But Lafayette, now a member of the Chamber, who during the last quarter of a century had taken no part in public affairs, having gotten intelligence of this scheme, proposed and carried a resolution that the Chamber should declare itself in permanence, and that every attempt to dissolve it should be considered an act of high treason. Lucien Bonaparte and some of

the Ministers made an unsuccessful attempt to induce the deputies to reconsider this resolution, and to invest Napoleon with a temporary dictatorship; Lafayette and the majority insisted on his immediate abdication. Napoleon was not in a situation to resist. On the 22nd of June he gave in his abdication, but at the same time proclaimed his son Emperor of the French, with the title of Napoleon II. His abdication was received, the reservation in favour of his son ignored, and a Provisional Executive Commission was appointed by the Chamber. Fouché (Duke of Otranto), the executioner of the Lyonese, was elected president of this Commission. Napoleon lingered in Paris till June 29th in the hope of some favourable occurrence, when, as the Allies were within sight of the capital, he took his departure for Malmaison. The Provisional Commission despatched Sebastiani, Laforêt, Lafayette, Pontecoulant, Benjamin Constant, and d'Argenson to the Allied Sovereigns at Heidelberg, to treat on the basis of the national independence and the inviolability of the French soil; but the Sovereigns replied, that no negociations could be entered into till Bonaparte should be replaced in the custody of the Allies, and thus disabled from again disturbing the repose of Europe. Wellington and Blücher also refused an armistice proposed by Davoust.

The remains of the routed army, as well as Grouchy's corps, had found their way to Paris; and at the beginning of July, 90,000 troops of the line and 12,000 federals, the whole under the command of Davoust, were preparing to defend the capital. But their resistance against the overwhelming masses of the Allies would have been unavailing, and, to save Paris from the horrors of a siege, Davoust signed, with Wellington and Blücher, a military convention, or capitulation, at St. Cloud, July 3rd; by which the French army was to evacuate Paris within three days, and to retire beyond the Loire. On the 6th the Allies entered the capital. The Prussians displayed great animosity against the French. The English commander had much difficulty in restraining Blücher from blowing up the bridge of Jena, a monument of Prussian disgrace. Louis XVIII. re-entered Paris, July 8th, and thus put an end to the interregnum of the Hundred Days. Napoleon, after staying some time in the Isle of Aix, with the design of taking a passage to America, but dreading the risks of the voyage, and preferring to throw himself on the generosity of the English to running the risk of being captured by them, delivered himself up, on the 15th of July, to Captain Maitland, commander of the "Bellerophon," an English ship of the line which happened to be stationed off Rochefort. Captain Maitland gave him no promises, except to convey him in

safety to England, Napoleon had, on the previous day, written an inflated letter to the Prince Regent, invoking the hospitality of the British nation, and comparing himself to Themistocles when he sought an asylum from Admetus. The fallen Emperor was conveyed to Plymouth, but was not allowed to land. On the 7th of August he was transferred to the "Northumberland," the flag-ship of Admiral Sir G. Cockburn, to be conveyed, agreeably to the decision of the Allies, to the Island of St. Helena. In that remote spot, where not even hope could solace him with the prospect of a change of fortune, he lingered out the remainder of his extraordinary and checkered career, till disease terminated at once his life and his repining, May 5th 1821.

TABLE OF CONTEMPORARY SOVEREIGNS

FROM 1815 TO 1857.

(*The Years show the end of their Reigns.*)

AUSTRIA.		SPAIN.		FRANCE.		ENGLAND.		POPES.	
Francis I.	1835	Ferdinand VII.	1833	Louis XVIII.	1824	George III.	1820	Pius VII.	1823
Ferdinand I.	1848	Isabella II.	—	Charles X.	1830	George IV.	1830	Leo XII.	1829
Francis Jos. I.	—			Louis Philippe	1848	William IV.	1837	Pius VIII.	1831
				Republic	1852	Victoria	—	Gregory XVI.	1846
				Napoleon III.	—			Pius IX.	—
RUSSIA.		**PRUSSIA.**		**TURKEY.**		**DENMARK.**		**SWEDEN.**	
Alexander I.	1825	Frederick William III.	1840	Mahmoud II.	1839	Frederick VI.	1839	Charles XIII.	1818
Nicholas I.	1855	Frederick William IV.	—	Abdul Medschid	—	Christian VIII.	1848	Charles John XIV.	1844
Alexander II.	—					Frederick VII.	—	Oscar I.	—

BOOK VIII.

FROM THE FALL OF NAPOLEON I. IN 1815 TO THE CLOSE OF THE CRIMEAN WAR IN 1857.

THE Emperor Napoleon I., by his attempts to coerce under the yoke of a universal monarchy nations entirely dissimilar in language, religion, interests, and manners, had carried to its highest pitch the dynastic system which had prevailed since the Peace of Westphalia; a system characterised by wars waged merely to gratify the ambition of some monarch, or to promote the interests of some reigning house, and still consigned to infamy by the unhallowed partition of Poland. The fall of the French Empire marks the beginning of a new epoch. That the spirit of the previous era is wholly extinct, it might, indeed, be premature, in the face of some recent events, to assert; yet it can hardly be doubted that it has at least been greatly modified by the progress of public opinion. The interests of peoples seem now to have superseded those of monarchs; dynasties have yielded up their pretensions to *nationalities*; and though ambition may sometimes cloak its schemes under this more liberal name, it is to be hoped that some of the wars of the last century could not be successfully repeated. The union of cognate races, as effected by the revolutions of Belgium, Greece, and Italy, presents at least a striking and agreeable contrast to their forcible separation and their subjugation under foreign sceptres. But the new era, still in progress of developement, is hardly yet historical; and we shall, therefore, content ourselves with a brief summary of the principal events of European history since the fall of Napoleon.

One of the first acts of Louis XVIII. on re-entering his capital was to appoint Talleyrand his chief minister. The army of the Loire submitted, and Marshal Macdonald undertook the somewhat difficult task of dismissing the troops to their homes. Yet the war continued on the north-eastern frontier. The French commandants of some of the fortresses in that quarter, though willing to recognise the authority of Louis XVIII., refused to surrender to foreign troops, and had to be reduced by siege. As it was considered necessary to the security of the throne that the allies should continue to occupy some parts of France, the English army was stationed in the district north of the Seine, the Duke of Wellington having his headquarters at Paris; the Prussians were cantoned to the west of that capital, between the Seine and Loire; the Russians were distributed about the Oise, the Meuse, and the Moselle, while Prince Schwarzenberg's headquarters were at Fontainebleau. The eastern and southern provinces of France, including Provence, were also occupied by divisions of the allied armies, so that two-thirds of France were in their power.

In July were begun the negociations for the Second Peace of Paris. The allies commenced by an act of justice which had been neglected on the first occupation of Paris. The French were compelled to restore to their lawful owners those works of art which they had carried off from various European capitals in order to adorn their own. The definitive treaties between France and the allies were signed November 20th 1815. France was now deprived of part of the territories which the Peace of 1814 had left to her. The Duchy of Bouillon, the towns of Philippeville, Marienburg, Saar-louis, Saar-brück, and some adjacent districts, were assigned to the new kingdom of Belgium and to Prussia. The part of Alsace north of the Lauter was also detached from France, including Landau, which became a fortress of the German Confederation. Part of the county of Gex was assigned to Geneva, but Ferney was retained by France. The fortifications of Hüningen were to be demolished. From Geneva to the Mediterranean the line of demarcation existing in 1790 was to be followed, so that the King of Sardinia regained that part of Savoy which had been left to France by the former peace. The indemnity to be paid to the allies for the expenses of the war was fixed at seven hundred million francs (28,000,000*l.* sterling). A number of fortresses extending along the northern frontier were to be occupied, at the expense of France, by an allied army not exceeding 150,000 men for a maximum period of five years.[1] This term, however, was eventually much abridged.

[1] Condé, Valenciennes, Bouchain, Cambrai, Le Quesnoy, Maubeuge, Landrecies,

The overthrow of Napoleon readjusted the balance of power in Europe, now held by the Pentarchy, or five great Powers; viz. England, Austria, Prussia, Russia, and France, under the restored dynasty of the Bourbons. The Emperor Alexander I., who was somewhat of an enthusiast, conceived the idea of sanctioning the new system by a holy bond, and of regulating in future the measures of policy by the precepts of religion. With this view he persuaded the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia to join with him in a treaty executed at Paris September 26th 1815, and subsequently styled the Holy Alliance.[2] In the preamble to this Convention, the signataries solemnly declared that the object of the act was to manifest to the universe their firm resolution to take for their rule of conduct, both in the administration of their respective States, and in their political relations with foreign Governments, those holy and Christian precepts of justice, charity, and peace, which are not applicable to private life alone, but which ought also directly to influence the counsels of princes, and to guide all their steps, as the only means of consolidating and perfecting all human institutions. It is needless to say that this solemn act of hypocrisy, like other holy leagues of the same description, served rather as an instrument of despotism than as a bond of peace and good-will upon earth. It was regarded with but little favour in England, but it was acceded to by most of the other Christian States of Europe.

Royal ordinances of July 24th had expelled twenty-nine members from the Chamber of Peers, had ordered nineteen generals or other officers, who had abandoned the King, to be arraigned before courts-martial; and thirty-eight persons to be placed under the *surveillance* of the police till they should be either banished or brought before the tribunals. The most remarkable among the generals condemned, was Marshal Ney, "the bravest of the brave," who was shot on the morning of December 7th, near the Observatory of the Luxembourg. But on the whole the measures adopted by Louis XVIII. were marked by moderation. He disappointed the emigrants and ultra-royalists by declining to support their cause so warmly as they had hoped. In the south of France the fanatical royalists and priest-party took a ferocious vengeance on the republicans and Bonapartists. Marshal Brune, one of Napoleon's generals in Provence, was slain by the populace at Avignon in open day, in the presence of several thousand spectators. At Nîmes, regularly organised bands, led by Trestaillon and Pointu, slaughtered the

Avesnes, Rocroi, Givet, Charlemont, Mézières, Sedan, Montmédy, Thionville, Longwy, Bitche, and the *tête-du-pont* of Fort Louis. For an analysis of the treaties, see Koch et Schöll, *Traités de Paix*, t. xi. p. 498 sqq. [2] *Ibid.* p. 552 sqq.

Protestants as Bonapartists; and similar scenes took place at Toulouse and other towns.

It has been remarked that history often repeats itself. To the other parallels afforded, externally, at least, between the French and the English revolutions, may be added the position and conduct of the two Bourbons, restored like the two Stuarts to their ancestral throne. Louis XVIII., though far from popular, and ridiculed and despised for his obesity and inactivity, contrived like his prototype, Charles II., through good sense, and by accommodating himself to the spirit of the times, to die in possession of the crown; while his brother, the Count d'Artois, like the Duke of York in England, by his rigid adherence to obsolete principles, ultimately forfeited his own rights and those of his family. While Louis courted the middle class, at that time the predominant one in France, his brother Charles adhered exclusively to the nobles and clergy; and the Pavillon Marsan, that part of the Tuileries which he inhabited, became the rendezvous of the admirers of the ancient *régime*, and the focus of reactionary intrigues. With all his bigotry, however, Charles possessed a certain dignity of character which saved him from contempt; and though he was ridiculed as a Don Quixote and a Jesuit, he was hated rather than despised.

In September, Talleyrand was superseded in the ministry by the Duke de Richelieu, one of the best and most respectable of the emigrant nobles, who had distinguished himself in the Russian service, as governor of Odessa, by his humanity and ability. At the same time Decazes replaced, as head of the police, Fouché, Duke of Otranto, the blood-stained missionary of Nantes. Richelieu's influence with the Emperor Alexander succeeded in procuring for France a mitigation of the terms imposed by the treaties of November 20th 1815. Already in February 1817, the allied Courts had consented to reduce the army of occupation by 30,000 men, and the Congress of allied Sovereigns, which assembled at Aix-la-Chapelle at the end of September 1818, decreed that the occupation should be entirely terminated in the following November. The sum payable by France was also reduced to 265 millions, of which 100 millions were to be acquitted by inscriptions on the great book of the public debt of France. The CONGRESS OF AIX-LA-CHAPELLE put the finishing hand to the pacification of Europe. France as well as England now formally acceded, by a protocol signed November 15th, to the principles of the European Pentarchy for the maintenance of peace, published in a Declaration of the same date, and to be upheld by means of conferences and congresses.

The Congresses of Laibach in 1821 and of Verona in 1822 were the result of this agreement.

In December 1818, Richelieu, alarmed at the number of Liberal members returned to the Assembly, among whom was Lafayette, resigned the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, in which he was succeeded by General Dessolles; but Descazes, who now became Minister of the Interior, was the real chief of the Cabinet. A more liberal policy was now adopted: the freedom of the press was extended, and an amnesty granted to many banished persons. Descazes was supported by the party called the *Doctrinaires*, which took its rise about this time. At its head was Royer Collard, and it counted in its ranks many men distinguished by their talent, as Guizot, Villemain, Barante, Molé, and others. But the assassination, by Louvel, of the Duke de Berri, second son of the Count d'Artois, when returning from the opera, February 13th 1820, although it appears to have been the isolated act of a fanatic, occasioned a return to less liberal measures. Louis, at the instance of his brother and of the Duchess of Angoulême, now reluctantly dismissed Descazes, and Richelieu returned once more to power. Seven months after her husband's death, the Duchess of Berri gave birth to a prince, the Duke de Bordeaux (September 29th 1820). Richelieu introduced into the Ministry, M. Villèle, an ultra-royalist, who, in December 1822, became Prime Minister. The revolutions against the Bourbon Governments in Spain and Italy in 1820, to which we must now briefly advert, produced in France a further reaction, which at length compelled Richelieu to retire.

We have already adverted to the restoration of Ferdinand VII. in Spain. At once weak and wicked, superstitious and unprincipled, Ferdinand had returned from his French captivity full of projects of vengeance against his subjects, and with a determination to abolish the reforms introduced by the liberal Cortès in Church and State. During the war and the captivity of Ferdinand, the Cortès had, in March 1812, established a new Constitution, by which the royal authority was reduced to little more than a name. That Assembly was declared altogether independent of the King, and was to consist only of one Chamber, invested with the legislative power; the prerogative of the King in that respect being restricted to proposing, and a temporary *veto*. The Cortès were also to determine yearly the amount of the land and sea forces; to confirm treaties of alliance and commerce; and to propose to the King the members of his Council of State. All ecclesiastical benefices and judicial offices were to be filled up only according to

the suggestions of this Council. The King was not to leave the kingdom, nor to marry, without the consent of the Cortès, under the penalty of losing his throne.

Ferdinand VII., after his return, immediately applied himself to restore the ancient *régime*, in all its unmitigated bigotry and exclusiveness. He issued decrees, in May 1814, by which all Liberals and Freemasons, and all adherents of the Cortès, and of the officers appointed by them, were either compelled to fly, or subjected to imprisonment, or at least deposed. All national property was wrested from the purchasers of it, not only without compensation, but fines were even imposed upon the holders. All dissolved convents were re-established. The Inquisition was restored, and Mir Capillo, Bishop of Almeria, appointed Grand Inquisitor, who acted with fanatical severity, and is said to have incarcerated 50,000 persons for their opinions, many of whom were subjected to torture. Guerilla bands were dissolved, their leaders dismissed without reward, and commands in the regular army bestowed only upon the nobles. The adherents of Joseph Bonaparte and of the former French Government were banished. By these measures, some of the bravest and most loyal spirits of the country were driven into the ranks of the opposition, and 10,000 persons are computed to have fled into France. The kingdom was governed by a *Camarilla*, consisting of the King's favourites, selected from the lowest and most worthless of the courtiers; while most of his faithful friends, the companions of his exile, were dismissed. This *Camarilla* administered justice and bestowed offices accordingly as it was bribed. With such ministers, whom Ferdinand was constantly changing and perfidiously betraying, he descended to vulgar wit, and amused himself by turning them into ridicule.

The French invasion of Spain had occasioned a revolution in Spanish America. Till the dethronement of the Royal Family of Spain, the American colonies had remained loyal, and an insurrection attempted by General Miranda in the Caraccas, in 1806, had been speedily suppressed. But, like the mother country, the colonists revolted at the usurpation of Napoleon and his brother Joseph; and thus, properly speaking, they are no more to be called rebels than the Spaniards of the Old World. As, however, they declined to submit to the *Juntas* erected in Spain, they were declared to be rebels by the Regency established at Cadiz, August 31st 1810. The insurrection had broken out in Venezuela in April 1810, whence in the course of the year it spread over Rio de la Plata, New Granada, Mexico, and Chili. The insurgents demanded to be put on an equality with the inhabitants of Spain, freedom of

manufactures and commerce, the admission of Spanish Americans to all offices, the restoration of the Jesuits, &c. The insurrection acquired its greatest strength in Venezuela, where it was first headed by Miranda, and subsequently, after 1813, by Simon Bolivar. In some of the other provinces, its progress, owing to the dissensions of the inhabitants, was not so rapid and successful. After the restoration of Ferdinand, however, the movement had gone too far to be recalled, even had that Sovereign and his commanders displayed more moderation and good faith than was actually the case. Ferdinand exhausted his disordered finances in a vain attempt to recover these colonies, for which purpose an expedition, under General Morillo, was despatched to America in 1815.[3]

The loss of the American colonies, and a bad system of rural economy, by which agriculture was neglected in favour of sheep-breeding, had reduced Spain to great poverty. This state of things naturally affected the finances; the troops were left unpaid, and broke out into constant mutinies. A successful insurrection of this kind, led by Colonels Quiroga and Riego, occurred in 1820. Mina, who had distinguished himself as a guerilla leader, but, having compromised himself in a previous mutiny, had been compelled to fly into France, now recrossed the Pyrenees to aid the movement. The Constitution of 1812 was proclaimed at Saragossa; and the cowardly Ferdinand, alarmed by the threats of General Ballesteros, who told him that he must either concede or abdicate, was also obliged to proclaim it at Madrid, March 8th 1820. The Cortès were convened in July, when Ferdinand opened the assembly with an hypocritical speech, remarkable for its exaggeration of Liberal sentiments. The Cortès immediately proceeded again to dissolve the convents, and even to seize the tithes of the secular clergy, on the pretext that the money was required for the necessities of the State. The Inquisition was once more abolished, the freedom of the press ordained, the right of meeting and forming clubs restored; a large number of persons was dismissed from office and replaced by members of the Liberal party. The orators

[3] It is impossible for us to describe the struggle between Spain and her colonies. The chief results were, that Bolivar achieved the independence of Venezuela and Granada, which were erected into the Republic of Columbia, Dec. 1819. In the previous May, the States of the Rio de la Plata, or Buenos Ayres, had been constituted into the Argentine Republic. The independence of Chili and Peru was also secured by the aid of Bolivar, and the Republic of Bolivia was established in Upper Peru in August 1825. In Mexico, Iturbide, who had become leader of the insurgents after the death of Hidalgos, Morelos, and Mina, caused himself to be proclaimed Emperor in 1822, but was dethroned in the following year, when the Republic of Mexico formed a league with Columbia. The independence of Columbia, Mexico, and Buenos Ayres was recognised by Great Britain Jan. 1st 1825. In Paraguay, Francia ruled as despot from 1810 to 1837.

of the Assembly, many of whom, as well as of the ministers, had been confined in State prisons or the dungeons of the Inquisition, rivalled one another in the extravagance of their speeches.

The Spanish revolutionists were divided into three parties: the *Decamisados*, answering to the French *sans-culottes*; the *Communeros*, who were for a moderate constitutional system; and the *Anilleros*, known by the symbol of a ring; who, dreading the interference of the Holy Alliance, endeavoured to conciliate the people with the crown. On the whole, the insurgents used their victory with moderation, and, with the exception of some few victims of revenge, contented themselves with depriving their opponents, the *Serviles*, of their places and emoluments. There were, indeed, some riots in Madrid in 1821; when the *Decamisados* broke into the prison where the Canon Vinuesa was confined, who had attempted a counter-revolution, and murdered him with a hammer. General Morillo, who after his return from America had been appointed Governor of Madrid, attempted to re-establish a reactionary ministry, but was compelled by popular agitation to dismiss it. The revolution, though originated by the soldiery, was adopted by the more educated class of citizens. On the other hand, the clergy and the peasantry were bitterly opposed to it. In the summer of 1821, guerilla bands were organised in the provinces in the cause of Church and King, and obtained the name of "Armies of the Faith." In Seo d'Urgel was even established, in July 1822, what was called a "Regency during the captivity of the King," under the presidency of the Marquis Mata Florida, the Bishop of Tarragona, and Baron d'Eroles. In these civil disturbances dreadful atrocities were committed on both sides.

The ravages of the yellow fever, which had been imported from America, and carried off many thousands, had some effect in allaying these disturbances. The French Government, with the ulterior design of interfering in Spanish affairs, seized the pretext of this disorder to place a cordon of troops on the Pyrenees; to which the Spaniards opposed an army of observation. Ferdinand, relying on the Army of the Faith, and on his Foreign Minister, Martinez de la Rosa, a *Moderado*, thought he might venture on a *coup d'état* before the appearance of the French; but his guards were worsted in a street fight, July 7th 1822. General Ballasteros and Morillo declared themselves averse to any infringement of the Constitution; at the same time Riego suddenly returned to Madrid, and was elected President of the Cortès. Ferdinand was now base enough to applaud and thank the victors, to dismiss the *Moderados* from the Ministry, and to replace them by *Exaltados*, or Radicals. This

state of things had attracted the attention of the Holy Alliance. In October 1822, the three northern monarchs assembled in congress at Verona, to adopt some resolution respecting Spain. The policy of Metternich was now predominant. The Emperor Alexander had more than ever set his face against revolutions, had given up all his eastern projects, and even abandoned the revolutionary Greeks, however serviceable that movement might eventually prove to him. It was the object of the three allied Powers to abandon the co-operation of France in the affairs of Spain, and to bear down the opposition of England; and they addressed a note to the Spaniards requiring the restoration of absolutism. The Duke of Wellington, who had attended the Congress for England, on returning home through Paris, warned Louis against the Spanish war, to which, indeed, the French King was himself averse. But the Spaniards refused to listen to moderate counsels, and replied haughtily to all the expostulations of France; so that Chateaubriand himself, who had now become Minister at War, though he had opposed at Verona the use of force, now adopted the contrary opinion.

In reply to the note of the three allied Powers, San Miguel, the Spanish Minister for Foreign Affairs, told them that the Constitution was the same which had been recognised by the Emperor Alexander in 1812, and declined to make any alteration; whereupon the ambassadors of the three Powers demanded and received their passports, January 11th 1823. The French ambassador followed their example, so that only the English Minister remained behind, whose endeavours to inculcate moderation upon the Spaniards served perhaps only to blunt the energy of resistance. In the spring, the French army of observation, which had been increased to 100,000 men, was placed under the command of the Duke of Angoulême. To resist the threatened invasion, the Spanish Government appointed Mina to the defence of Catalonia, Ballasteros to that of Navarre, Morillo took the command in Galicia, Asturia, and Leon, while O'Donnell, Count of Abisbal, was stationed with the reserve in New Castile, to support either of those generals, as occasion might require. But these troops were few and ill disciplined; while in Old Castile stood guerilla bands, under the priest Merino, ready to aid the French invasion. An attempt on the part of Ferdinand to dismiss his Liberal ministry induced the ministers and the Cortès to remove him to Seville (March 20th 1823), whither the Cortès were to follow.

The Duke of Angoulême addressed a proclamation to the Spaniards from Bayonne, April 2nd, in which he told them that he

did not enter Spain as an enemy, but to liberate the captive King, and, in conjunction with the friends of order, to re-establish the altar and the throne. The French crossed the Bidassoa, April 7th. The only serious resistance which they experienced was from Mina. Ballasteros was not strong enough to oppose them, while the traitor O'Donnell entered into negociations with the enemy, and opened to them the road to the capital. Ballasteros was compelled to retire into Valencia, and the French entered Madrid, May 23rd. A Regency, composed of the Duke del Infantado and four other nobles, was now instituted till the King should be rescued from the hands of the Liberals, and immediately commenced an unmeasured reaction. A French corps was despatched into Catalonia against Mina, who still held out in that province; and another against Seville, where the Cortès had reopened their sittings; but on the advance of the French they retired to Cadiz, June 12th, taking with them the King, whom they declared of unsound mind, and a provisional Regency was appointed. Zayas arrested for a while the march of the French at Talavera de la Reyna, but was compelled to yield to superior numbers. Mina was shut up in Catalonia; Ballasteros, driven from Valencia into Granada, was defeated in the mountains near Compillo de Arenas, when he capitulated and acknowledged the Regency at Madrid. About the same time Morillo surrendered at Corunna. These events enabled the Duke of Angoulême to march with the bulk of his army to Cadiz, where he arrived August 16th. Fort Troçadero was captured on the 31st, Fort St. Petri on the 20th of September, when the bombardment of the city was begun. Cadiz having capitulated, October 1st, Valdez conducted the King to the French camp in a boat, while the Cortès made their escape by sea. All further resistance being now hopeless, Mina also capitulated, and surrendered to the French the fortresses which he still held in Catalonia, on condition of a free and unmolested retreat (November 2nd). Sir Robert Wilson and a few other Englishmen had aided the Spanish Liberals in this struggle. The Duke of Angoulême returned to Paris before the end of the year, but Spain continued to be occupied by an army of 40,000 French.

The first act of Ferdinand after his release was to publish a proclamation, October 1st, revoking all that had been done since March 7th 1820. The Inquisition, indeed, was not restored; but the vengeance exercised by the secular tribunals was so atrocious that the Duke of Angoulême issued an order prohibiting arrests not sanctioned by the French commander: an act, however, which on the principle of non-interference was disavowed by the

French Government. The brave Riego was condemned to death at Madrid, November 7th, conveyed to the place of execution on an ass, with every mark of ignominy and insult, and hanged amid the approving shouts of the mob on a gibbet of enormous height, erected for the purpose. The King and Queen of Spain made their public entry into Madrid on the 13th with a ridiculous pomp, sitting on a triumphal car twenty feet high, drawn by 100 men in green and pink, and surrounded by male and female dancers. The whole Spanish army was now disbanded, and its place supplied by the "Army of the Faith." These men were gradually formed into a militia called "Royal Volunteers," who plundered and murdered the Constitutionalists to their hearts' content; while the *Camarilla*, now directed by Victor Saez, the King's confessor, only laughed at the exhortations to moderation addressed to them by the French and English ambassadors. It is computed that 40,000 Constitutionalists, chiefly of the educated classes, were thrown into prison. The French remained in Spain till 1827.

M. Zea Bermudez, the new Minister, endeavoured to rule with moderation. But he was opposed on all sides. The nobles and clergy attacked him because he attempted to tax them. But his most dangerous enemy was the Apostolic Junta, erected in 1824 for the purpose of carrying out to its full extent, and independently of the Ministry, the victory of bigotry and absolutism. Saez was at the head of it, and the King sometimes attended its sittings. Every day it engrossed more and more the whole power of the State, and was thus engaged in continual conflicts with the Ministry. In 1825 Zea Bermudez, having caused the notorious Bessières to be shot for having organised riots in order to compel the King to dismiss his Liberal Ministry, was compelled to resign. He was succeeded by the Duke del Infantado, who in turn succumbed to intrigue. The Junta now procured the appointment of the weak and incapable Salmon, and in the spring of 1827 excited in Catalonia an insurrection of the *Serviles*. The insurgents styled themselves *Aggraviados* (aggrieved persons), because the King did not restore the Inquisition, and because he sometimes listened to his half Liberal ministers, or to the French and English ambassadors, instead of suffering the Junta to rule uncontrolled. The history of the revolt is obscure. Saez, who had been relegated to his bishopric of Tortosa, and probably also the Northern Powers, were concerned in it, and the object seems to have been to dethrone Ferdinand in favour of his brother Carlos. But the Duke del Infantado, during his brief administration, had restored a regular army of 50,000 men, at the head of which España, accompanied

by the King in person, proceeded into Catalonia, when the insurgents were subdued, the province disarmed, and many persons executed.

Portugal was also shaken by revolutions during this period. The Regent, who on the death of his mother Maria, March 20th 1816, ascended the throne with the title of John VI., continued to reside in Brazil after the downfall of Napoleon; while Lord Beresford, as a member of the Portuguese Regency, as well as commander-in-chief of the army, directed the affairs of Portugal. The discontent at this state of things was fanned into a revolt by the Spanish Revolution of 1820. Colonel Sepulveda established in August a Provisional Government in Oporto; and General Amarante, who had been despatched from Lisbon to quell the revolt, was compelled by his own troops to join the Junta of Oporto. In the middle of September a Constitution even more Liberal than that of Spain was proclaimed in Lisbon, and a *Junta* appointed to conduct the Government in the King's name. Lord Beresford, who had been absent in the Brazils during these occurrences, on his return to Portugal early in October, found that his power had departed, and was compelled to return with his officers to England. The English Government forbore to interfere, and left the settlement of matters to King John. That Sovereign was himself driven from Brazil in April 1821, by an insurrection of the Portuguese soldiery in favour of the Constitution promulgated in the mother country, and sailed for Portugal, leaving his eldest son, Don Pedro, Regent of Brazil. On his arrival in Portugal in July, John VI. accepted the Constitution which had been framed during his absence; but his consort, Charlotte, a sister of Ferdinand VII. of Spain, refused to take the oath to it.

The interference of the Holy Alliance and of the French in the affairs of Spain, encouraged the reactionary party in Portugal. Towards the end of February 1823, Count Amarante, the Queen's most distinguished adherent, raised the standard of revolt at Villa Real, and was immediately joined by several regiments. Don Miguel, the Queen's youngest and favourite son, fled secretly from Lisbon towards the end of May, and proceeded to the camp of the insurgents; when Sepulveda, betraying the freedom which he had himself established, also joined the reactionary movement. The people of Lisbon followed the impulse of the soldiery; the Cortès, seeing themselves abandoned, dispersed; the ministers resigned; the King as usual submitted, and on the 5th of June the new Constitution was abolished. From this time all the Queen's efforts were directed to dethrone her husband and procure the crown for

Don Miguel. The Marquis Loulé, the King's chamberlain and favourite, who had the reputation of a Liberal, was found murdered, March 1st 1824, and the Minister-at-War received letters threatening him with a similar fate. Don Miguel, having assembled the garrison of Lisbon, April 30th, exhorted them to extirpate all Freemasons and Liberals; caused all generals, ministers, and officers suspected of Liberalism to be apprehended, and even the King, his father, to be placed under surveillance. John would no doubt now have been compelled to resign his crown, but for the interference of the French and English ambassadors and the diplomatic corps. To avoid the machinations of his son, John escaped on board the "Windsor Castle," a British man-of-war, in the Tagus, May 9th, whither he was followed by all the foreign ambassadors. From this refuge the King issued orders forbidding anybody to obey his son; when Don Miguel, finding himself abandoned by part of the troops, threw himself at his father's feet and implored his forgiveness. This he obtained, but he was ordered to leave the kingdom, and took up his residence at Vienna. While these events were passing in the mother country, Don Pedro constituted himself Emperor of Brazil by the aid of the revolutionary party, October 12th 1822, and the Empire of Brazil was declared independent. John VI. was induced through British mediation to recognise the new empire, May 15th 1825.

The Italian peninsula, like the Iberian, was also shaken by revolutions. We have already mentioned the return of Pope Pius VII. to Rome. Pius re-established, so far as was possible, the ancient state of things, and was favoured by all the European Powers. Ferdinand IV., restored to his Kingdom of the Two Sicilies, had been put as it were under the guardianship of Austria by his treaty of alliance with that Power of April 29th 1815. By a Concordat with the Pope, Ferdinand restored the Papal influence in Naples, though he refused to acknowledge his vassalage to the Holy See by the ancient tribute of a white palfrey. An attempt by Murat to regain the crown proved fatal to that adventurer. Murat, the son of a village shopkeeper, not content with an asylum in the Austrian States, and a fortune such as he could not have ventured to dream of at the commencement of his military career, made a descent at Pizzo, in Calabria, October 8th 1815, in the hope that the people would declare in his favour; but falling into a snare laid for him by the *podestà* of the place, he was captured and shot as a common rebel, October 13th.

Various secret societies had sprung up in Naples and Sicily, which on the departure of the Austrian troops in 1817 began to

manifest themselves. The chief of these were the so-called *Carbonari*, or charcoal-men: to oppose whom was instituted the loyal society of *Calderaii* (tinkers or braziers, who use the coals). The Spanish revolution of 1820 had an electrical effect at Naples; and it is remarkable that here also the insurrection was organised by the soldiery. On the night of June 1st, Lieutenant Morelli proclaimed the Constitution at Nola, at the head of a squadron of horse; and, hastening to Avellino, was immediately joined both by the civil and military officers there, who had long been *Carbonari*. General Pepé added to the insurgent ranks a regiment from Naples; while General Carascosa, whom the King had despatched against them with 5000 men, remained undecided and inactive. Symptoms of revolt having manifested themselves at Naples itself, the King, without striking a blow, conceded all demands; dismissed his Ministers, replaced them by Liberals, and proclaimed the Spanish Constitution of 1812, which the people hardly knew even by name. Ferdinand IV., under the pretext of illness, now abandoned the Government to his son Francis, Duke of Calabria; when Carascosa and Pepé returned to Naples, and the army, the people, the Court, and the Crown Prince himself, assumed the *Carbonari* colours (black, pink, and sky-blue).

The Neapolitan revolution was entirely a military one, and the only fighting that occurred was between some regiments which differed in opinion. But it was followed in Sicily by a popular insurrection. The Viceroy, General Naselli, having displayed the *Carbonari* colours, the people of Palermo assumed the yellow badge of Sicily; and on the festival of St. Rosalia, July 15th, the chief one of the Palermitans, they demanded the independence of the island under a prince of the Royal house. General Church, an Englishman, who commanded the garrison of Palermo, having attempted to interfere, was compelled to fly for his life; Naselli also fled, after having established a Provisional Junta, to which, however, no respect was paid. The people, having defeated the troops in a sanguinary battle, obtained entire possession of Palermo, which during two consecutive days became a scene of robbery and murder (July 17th, 18th). A new Junta was now appointed, at the head of which was the Prince of Villa Franca, and one Vaglica, of Monreale, a monk. But the revolutionary Government at Naples despatched 5000 men against Palermo, and compelled that city to capitulate, October 5th.

The Neapolitan revolution had inspired the Austrian Government with alarm for the safety of all Italy. Metternich brought about a Congress at Troppau in October 1820, which was attended

by the Emperors Alexander and Francis, and the Crown Prince of Prussia; and by the ministers, Metternich, for Austria; Hardenberg, for Prussia; Nesselrode and Capodistrias, for Russia; Caraman and Laferronays, for France; and Sir Charles Stewart, for England. In spite of the opposition of England and France, and even at first, in some degree, of Russia, which dreaded too great a preponderance of Austria in Italy, Metternich succeeded in forming a League between Austria, Russia, and Prussia for the suppression of this rebellion. The Congress was transferred to Laibach in January 1821, when it was determined to send an Austrian army into the Neapolitan dominions. France acquiesced, and England, single-handed, could do nothing but protest. Next month, 60,000 Austrians, under General Frimont, marched into the South of Italy, and after overcoming some slight resistance from Pepé and Carascosa, entered Naples, March 24th. Ferdinand now gave vent to the wrath which he had postponed at his restoration. The people were disarmed, all suspected persons were arrested, and confiscations and executions became the order of the day. Walmoden was sent with a body of Austrians into Sicily, to restore the ancient state of things in that island.

The effects of the Spanish Revolution also extended to Piedmont, where Victor Emanuel after his restoration had placed everything as much as possible on the old footing. The *Carbonari* were also active here, and were in communication with those of Naples, and with the malcontents in France. They even induced Charles Albert, Prince of Carignano, to enter into their plots. That Prince, though but a distant relation of the King's, was presumptive heir to the throne; Victor Emanuel having only a daughter, whose succession was barred by the Salic law, and being now of an age that rendered the prospect of his having further issue highly improbable. The *Carbonari* flattered Charles Albert with the hope of becoming King of all Italy if the Revolution should succeed; and after some hesitation he agreed to enter into their schemes. On the 9th of March 1821, Colonel Arsaldi proclaimed at Alessandria the Spanish Constitution, and the troops at Turin also hoisted the three-coloured flag. Victor Emanuel, abandoning the government to the Prince of Carignano, abdicated the throne March 13th in favour of his brother, Charles Felix, then residing at Modena. The insurrection was put down by a portion of the troops that remained faithful to the King, assisted by an Austrian force under Count Bubna. Victor Emanuel, however, declined to resume the crown which he had relinquished. The Prince of Carignano, who had secretly assured the new King that he, as well as the higher class in general, was adverse to the revolution,

was only punished by two years' relegation from the court; and Charles Felix, who was also childless, maintained the Prince's right to the crown, in spite of the endeavours of Austria to obtain it for the Duke of Modena, son of the Archduke Ferdinand and of Beatrix, the only daughter of Victor Emanuel.

Lombardy also contained many secret societies, and was, in fact, the chief centre of the *Carbonari*; but such was the vigilance of the police, that any outbreak was prevented; though the Archduke Rainer, who resided with his family at Milan, fled at the first alarm of danger. Towards the end of 1821 the police discovered and captured some members of a secret society, among the most noted of whom were Confalionieri and Silvio Pellico. The latter, in a well-known work, has related the particulars of his imprisonment in the fortress of Spielberg at Brünn, the capital of Moravia. The Emperor himself is said to have regulated, down to the minutest particulars, the treatment of the prisoners confined there.

While the Austrian Government, guided by the counsels of Metternich, kept so vigilant an eye on the domestic affairs of other countries, the home administration was conducted on a system of *laissez-aller*, which, though popular enough with the indolent, pleasure-seeking Viennese, was highly detrimental to the interests of the State. Everything was neglected. In a time of peace, the Government got every year deeper into debt. The Russians, in conformity with the Peace of Adrianople, which we shall have to relate further on, were allowed to settle at the mouth of the Danube, and thus virtually to command that river. The harbour of Venice was suffered to fill with sand, and the steam navigation between that port and Trieste to be monopolised by the English. In the midst of this frivolity of the Austrians and their Government, the Bohemian, Hungarian, and Italian nationalities began to expand and to develope themselves into formidable Powers. The movement, taking its origin in Bohemia and Hungary in the study of national antiquities and literature, assumed at length a political cast, and begot a desire for national independence.[4] With regard to church matters, the Emperor and his minister were far from being bigoted. The exercise of intellect in the Church was discouraged; the pretensions of Rome were repressed, and the Pope was obliged to confirm the Italian bishops nominated by the Emperor. The Jesuits were excluded from the Austrian dominions till 1820, and were then only admitted in Italy and Galicia.

[4] Wolfgang Menzel, *Gesch. der letzten 40 Jahre*, B. i S. 26.

The after-shocks of that great social convulsion which had agitated Europe since 1792, were also felt in Germany as well as in Italy and the Spanish Peninsula. The Germans in general were desirous of an extension of their political liberties, and a confirmation of them by means of constitutions, which had indeed been promised by the Act of Confederation. This matter occasioned some serious disputes between the King of Würtemberg and his subjects. But the Germans are a people who seem little capable of initiating revolutionary movements, and require to be influenced by an impulse from without. Till the second French Revolution in 1830, political demonstrations in Germany were mostly confined to the students of the universities. These, however, were mere harmless mummeries, such as the adoption of a particular dress, the displaying of the German colours, and other acts of the same kind. The most remarkable demonstration occurred in 1817, on the celebration of the third centenary of the Reformation; when on the 18th of October, the anniversary of the battle of Leipsic, a number of students from various universities assembled at the Wartburg near Eisenach, the scene of Luther's concealment. After the festival had been celebrated with songs, speeches, and a procession by torch-light, most of the students dispersed; but a few remained behind, and amused themselves with burning certain insignia of the German military service, as well as some histories and other works of an anti-Liberal tendency. The whole affair was absurd and harmless enough, and would speedily have sunk into oblivion had it not been magnified into importance by the notice taken of it by the Prussian and Austrian ministers. Hence it attracted the attention of the Emperor Alexander, who in the following year took upon himself to interpose in the domestic affairs of Germany by directing his minister Stourdza to denounce to the Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle the revolutionary movements of the German students. Among the agents of Russia in Germany was Augustus von Kotzebue, the dramatist, who was suspected of transmitting to St. Petersburg information against the German students, and who, in a weekly paper which he edited, employed himself in turning them and their professors into ridicule. One Sand, a student of Jena, irritated by the denunciations which he heard against Kotzebue, and inflamed by a mistaken patriotism, set off for Mannheim, Kotzebue's residence, and stabbed him to the heart, March 23rd 1819. This act confirmed the German statesmen in their notion of a secret and wide-spread conspiracy, or rather, perhaps, afforded them a pretext to act as if such a thing really existed. At a

Congress of German ministers held at Carlsbad in July 1819, which was attended by the Princes Metternich and Hardenberg, Count Rechberg from Bavaria and others, were adopted what have been called the Carlsbad Resolutions, viz., a more rigid superintendence of the press, the suppression of the independence of the universities, and the establishment of a central Commission of Inquiry at Mentz to discover the existing conspiracy and to punish the participators in it. These Resolutions were adopted by the Federal Diet, September 27th. But though the Commission sat ten years, filled the prisons with students, and deprived of their chairs and even banished many of the professors at the universities, still it did not succeed in discovering any conspiracy, for in fact none existed.

Few other events of European importance occurred during the reign of Louis XVIII. of France. It will suffice to remind the reader of the English expedition to Algiers under Admiral Sir E. Pellew, afterwards Lord Exmouth, in August 1816; when, with the assistance of a small Dutch squadron, that nest of pirates was reduced to submission, though not without great loss on the part of the British. George III. expired, January 29th 1820, and was succeeded on the throne by George IV., who had long been Regent. Sweden also had experienced a change of Sovereign by the death of Charles XIII. in February 1818, and the accession of Bernadotte, Crown-Prince by adoption, with the title of Charles XIV. On the decease of Pope Pius VII., August 20th 1823, the Cardinal della Genga, a bigoted churchman, had been elected to the Papal chair, and assumed the title of Leo XII.

Louis XVIII. expired unregretted, September 16th 1824. His brother, Charles X., who now ascended the throne, had, during the last year or two, been virtually ruler of France. Some of his first measures seemed to promise liberality. He suffered the Constitution to remain, and he abolished the censorship of the press. This last act, however, was soon recalled; while the dismissal of 150 generals and superior officers of the time of Napoleon enlisted against him the feelings of the army. The favour which he showed to the House of Orleans seemed a concession made to the Liberal party. Louis Philippe, the head of the family, had returned to France. He had married Amelia, daughter of Ferdinand IV. of Naples, by whom he had many children, and appeared to lead far from the Court a quiet and secluded life. But under this exterior he concealed a devouring ambition, and sought to recommend himself to the people by the assumption of a citizenlike simplicity. Charles X. mistook his character. In the hope of conquering him

by generosity, and identifying the interests of the elder and younger Bourbons, Charles conferred upon him unsolicited the title of Royal Highness, and directed that the vast estates should be restored to him which, before the Revolution, had formed the *apanage* of the House of Orleans. But Louis Philippe did not respond to these generous acts by giving the King his political support.

Charles X. was crowned with the usual solemnities at Rheims, May 29th 1825. Fortunately a drop or two of the holy chrism with which St. Remigius had anointed Chlodowic had escaped all the perils of the Revolution, as if providentially preserved for the occasion! But Charles soon discovered from unmistakeable symptoms that the spirit of the ancient *régime* had irrevocably departed. The death of General Foy, one of the heads of the Liberal party, November 28th, gave occasion to a popular demonstration. His funeral was attended by 100,000 persons in mourning and bare-headed, though it rained in torrents, and a subscription for his widow reached a million francs, the Duke of Orleans contributing 10,000. The popular feeling was still more directly manifested at a review of the National Guard, April 29th 1827. No cries were heard but *Vive la Charte*! not a single cheer was raised for the King; and as soon as he had turned his back, the people shouted, *À bas les ministres*! *à bas les Jésuites*! On the next day the National Guard was dissolved. M. Villèle hoped to overcome the opposition to the Government by a new Chamber; but the elections gave 428 Liberals against 125 Ministerialists, and Villèle, who was highly unpopular, felt himself compelled to resign (January 3rd 1828).

M. de Martignac, who now became prime minister, introduced some popular measures. Among these were a new law of the press, relaxing the rules prescribed to journalists; and several regulations against the Jesuits. At this period Royer Collard was President of the second Chamber; on the left or Opposition benches of which sat Benjamin Constant, Lafayette, Casimir Périer, Lafitte, and other distinguished men. Martignac's foreign policy was also Liberal. He acted in conjunction with England in the affairs of Portugal and Greece; the French fleet took part in the battle of Navarino, and General Maison led a French army into the Morea. But before we relate those events, we must take a brief retrospect of the Greek Revolution.

The Turkish Empire had long been in a declining state. The Sultans were little more than the puppets of the Janissaries. The reforms attempted by Selim III. had terminated in his deposition

in 1807, as we have already related. His successor, Mustapha IV., had scarcely enjoyed the throne a year when he also was dethroned, July 28th 1808, in an insurrection headed by Mustapha Bairactar, Pasha of Rutschuk. His half-brother, Mahmoud II., was now elevated to the throne, which, however, he enjoyed only by sufferance of the Janissaries. The war which broke out again with Russia in 1809 had inflicted fresh losses on Turkey, and it would probably have gone hard with her had not the imminence of a war with France induced the Emperor Alexander to grant the Porte moderate conditions. By the Peace of Bucharest, however, May 28th 1812, Russia remained in possession of Bessarabia and the eastern part of Moldavia as far as the Pruth. Turkey seemed almost in a state of dissolution. The army was disorganised; in Egypt, Mehemet Ali had nearly rendered himself independent; in the provinces, the pashas were constantly revolting.

That the Turks should have so long maintained their empire in Europe over peoples so much more numerous than themselves, must perhaps be ascribed to the circumstance that these peoples are composed of various races unfitted to combine in any general political object, and that the Turk, as a man, is far superior to those over whom he rules. Exclusive of Armenians and Jews, the European subjects of the Sultan were composed of four distinct races, speaking different languages, and having different laws and customs, viz. Slavonians, Roumans, Albanians, and Greeks. Of these races the Slavonian, inhabiting Bulgaria, Servia, Bosnia, the Herzegovina, and Montenegro, amounting to upwards of seven million souls, is by far the most numerous. But these different Slavonic races were never united among themselves. The Montenegrins, in their inaccessible mountains, have preserved from the earliest period a sort of independence which the Servians alone of the remaining tribes have succeeded in achieving. The Rouman or Wallach population, inhabiting the trans-Danubian provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia, and still speaking a bastard Latin dialect, come next in point of number, counting about four million souls. The Albanians, or Arnauts, inhabiting the west coast of Turkey, the ancient Epirus, amount to about one and a half million. It was among these mountaineers that Ali, Pasha of Jannina, established, towards the end of the last century, a kind of independent rule. But the Greeks, the smallest in point of number of all these races, comprising hardly more than one million souls, have alone succeeded, by means of European sympathy, in asserting their entire independence of the Turks.

The Greeks inhabit the Morea, the adjoining province of Livadia,

the islands of the Archipelago, and the Ionian Islands, besides being scattered in some of the larger cities of the Turkish Empire, as Constantinople, Smyrna, &c. The increase of wealth, acquired by commerce, had inspired them with new tastes and more extended ideas. Young men of the upper classes were sent to Paris and other places for their education; in the schools established at home the Greek classics were read, and, whatever may be the right of the modern Greeks to trace their descent from the ancient Hellenes, inspired the youth with a love of liberty and a desire to emulate their assumed ancestors. Among a people thus disposed, the Spanish revolution of 1820 was not without its influence. Their aspirations for independence were encouraged by the *dilettante* Philhellenism which, in many parts of Europe, had become a sort of fashion. We have already adverted to the origin of this feeling in the time of Voltaire and Catherine II. of Russia; in which latter country, however, it was solely a political idea, cherished with the view of weakening Turkey and rendering her an easier prey.

A rising of the Greeks was first actually agitated by Alexander Ypsilanti, son of a Phanariot Hospodar of Wallachia, and a general in the Russian service. From Kischneff in Bessarabia, whither he had removed from Moscow the central committee of the Hetaireia, or society for establishing Greek independence, he despatched agents in all directions to incite the Greeks to insurrection (1820). Ali, Pasha of Jannina, took part in the movement, and was joined by Odysseus, the leader of some Albanian tribes despatched against Ali by the Sultan. In the spring of 1821 insurrectionary symptoms began to show themselves in the Morea, especially among the Mainotes; as well as in the north of the Morea, and at Athens; where the inhabitants compelled the Turks to take refuge in the Acropolis. A civil war now began, into the particulars of which we cannot enter. The chief events of the first two or three years were, the promulgation of a new Constitution for Greece on New Year's Day 1822; the reduction and murder of Ali Pasha, February 5th, the taking of Scio by the Turks in April, when they exercised some abominable cruelties; and the capture of Napoli di Romania by the Greeks, December 21st. At this period, Mavrocordato, a Phanariot of ancient family, was the principal leader of the revolution. The war continued through 1823, and it was not till the following year that the Western Powers began to interfere. Instead of seizing this opportunity to put down the insurrection by vigorous measures, Sultan Mahmoud treated the Greeks with moderation, in order apparently to deprive Russia of any pretence for intervention.

The Emperor Alexander refrained from interfering, though he proposed to the principal European Powers early in 1823 that the Greeks should be placed in the same relation to the Porte as the Danubian Principalities, and should be governed by four Hospodars. The European Governments, however, were not yet prepared to interfere, though in many countries a strong Philhellenistic feeling prevailed. The first active aid for the Greeks came from England. The accession of Canning to the Ministry, as Foreign Secretary, was favourable to their cause, and early in 1824 they obtained in London a loan of 800,000*l.* Lord Byron, an ardent Philhellenist, not content with assisting them from his own resources with money and arms, proceeded to Greece to give them his personal aid. He was accompanied by Colonel Stanhope. But a nearer acquaintance with the Greeks speedily dissipated all classical illusions. Byron died at Missolonghi, April 19th, from vexation, disappointment, and the effects of the climate. Stanhope was cheated and laughed at by the treacherous Odysseus, who seems to have possessed all the slyness of his classical namesake. In December 1824 Canning recognised the Greek Government by sending them a friendly note.

The death of the Emperor Alexander I., who, at the early age of forty-eight, expired after a short illness at Taganrog on the Sea of Asoph, December 1st 1825, accelerated the crisis of the Greek revolution. The Russian throne now devolved to Nicholas I., Alexander's youngest brother, in favour of whom Constantine, the second brother, Governor of Poland, had formally renounced his rights. Nicholas, however, seems not to have been aware of this circumstance; at all events, when the news of Alexander's death arrived at St. Petersburg, he caused the troops to swear obedience to Constantine. This circumstance was near producing a revolt. Constantine persisted in and publicly notified his renunciation of the crown. But, when the soldiery were again called upon to take the oath to Nicholas, a large portion of them, incited, it is said, by a faction led by Prince Trubetzkoi, who were for establishing a federative republic, refused to accept the change, and it became necessary to shoot down some of the regiments with artillery. When Nicholas was crowned at Moscow, Constantine hastened from Warsaw, was the first to do him homage, and embraced him in public, in order that no doubts might remain of the good faith of this transaction.

The accession of Nicholas inaugurated a new era in Russian policy. Alexander, like his predecessors since Peter the Great, had favoured the introduction of foreign culture and manners. Nicholas

was distinguished by his predilection for the ancient Muscovitism, and a bigoted adherence to the Greek Church. He made no secret of his pretensions to be the Pope and Emperor of the Greeks, wheresoever they might dwell, and it might be anticipated that he would not remain a passive spectator of the Greek revolution. The Duke of Wellington, who was sent to congratulate Nicholas on his accession, was at the same time instructed to come to an understanding with him on this question. The Czar at first disputed the right of other Powers to intermeddle with his policy regarding Turkey, but at length consented to sign a secret Convention, April 4th 1826, by which he recognised the new Greek State; which was, however, to pay a yearly tribute to the Porte. Turkey was to be compelled to accept this arrangement, to which the accession of the remaining members of the Pentarchy was to be invited.

It was precisely at this juncture that Turkey was still further weakened by a domestic convulsion. Towards the end of May 1826, Sultan Mahmoud II. issued a *hattischerif* for the reform of the Janissaries, which, however, still left them considerable privileges. Nevertheless, that licentious soldiery rose in insurrection on the night of June 14th, and plundered the palaces of three grandees whom they considered to be the authors of the decree. The riot was continued on the following day. But the Janissaries had neither plan nor leaders, and the Sultan, who had previously assured himself of the support of the *Ulemas*, as well as of the marine, the artillery, and other troops, putting himself at the head of the bands that remained faithful to him, and displaying the banner of the Prophet, surrounded a body of some 20,000 Janissaries, and caused great numbers of them to be shot down by his artillery; and though the rest now proffered unconditional submission, Mahmoud refused to accept it, and caused the greater part of them to be executed. The corps of Janissaries was now entirely abolished.

Mahmoud had vanquished his domestic enemies, but by the same act had rendered himself defenceless against external ones, and he now found himself compelled to submit to all the dictates of Russia regarding the points which had been left undecided by the Treaty of Bucharest. By the Treaty of Akierman, October 6th 1826, the Porte consented that the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia, though appointed by the Sultan for a period of seven years, should rule independently with the counsel of a divan chosen from among the Boyars, and should not be deposed without the sanction of the Czar. The Servians were to elect their

own princes; the Porte was to restore the districts that had been taken from them, and to refrain from interfering in their affairs. Russia was to occupy the east coast of the Black Sea, and her vessels were to have free entrance into all the Turkish waters.

Greece was not mentioned in this treaty; but Canning perceived the necessity of preventing the Russians from invading Turkey in its present defenceless state under pretence of the Greek cause. The events of the last year or two had been unfavourable for the Greeks. Mehemet Ali, who cherished hopes of the whole Turkish succession, had, early in 1825, despatched into the Morea an army of 17,000 men under his adopted son, Ibrahim, by whom the Greeks had been defeated, and Navarino taken in May, as well as the little island of Sphagia which lies before it. Hence Ibrahim made incursions into the Morea, but achieved no extensive or lasting conquests till in April 1826, having been joined by the Turkish commander Redschid Pasha, Missolonghi, after a six months' siege, yielded to their united arms, April 22nd 1826. The Greeks had now exhausted the loan, and their affairs began to look desperate. Canning apprehended that Nicholas might come to an understanding with Mehemet Ali to divide Turkey between them; and these fears were shared by the French and Austrian Cabinets. All that part of Greece not occupied by Ibrahim had fallen under the influence of Kolokotroni, a mere agent of Russia. Lord Cochrane and General Church, who arrived early in 1827 to assist the Greeks as volunteers, unadvisedly promoted the views of Russia, by aiding, on the recommendation of Kolokotroni, the election of Count Capodistrias as President of Greece. In this state of things was concluded the Treaty of London of July 6th 1827, which founded the Kingdom of Greece. Prince Metternich did not approve the erection of this State, for fear that religious sympathy might place it under Russian influence; but as the alternative lay between English and Russian views, he adopted the former. He also helped to persuade the French Government to consent to the erection of the Greek Kingdom, to which Charles X. was personally averse; but he stipulated that the new King should be selected from one of the European dynasties. To this Canning agreed, on condition that the Greeks should be allowed to choose their own Sovereign. This negociation was the most important act of Canning's short administration as Premier. He had held that office since April, and expired in the following August.

The Treaty of London was executed by only the three maritime Powers, England, France, and Russia; and in August the fleets

of those countries, under Admirals Codrington, De Rigny, and Heiden, appeared in the Greek waters to support the treaty. In the harbour of Navarino lay an Egyptian fleet of fifty-one men-of-war and upwards of forty other ships, which were now blockaded by the allied fleets. In consequence of Ibrahim having violated an armistice that had been agreed upon, and to arrest the horrible atrocities which he committed in the adjacent district, the allies entered the harbour and almost totally destroyed the Turco-Egyptian fleet, October 26th. After the battle, Codrington sailed to Egypt and compelled Mehemet Ali to recall Ibrahim.

The battle of Navarino, an act of doubtful policy on the part of the Western Powers, naturally enraged the Sultan. He declared all treaties at an end; and though he consented to allow the Greeks an amnesty, he altogether rejected the idea of recognising their independence. The ambassadors of the three Powers consequently took their departure from Constantinople, December 8th. To Russia the Porte gave particular cause of offence by refusing to carry out the stipulations of Akierman, and by an offensive *Firman* issued December 20th. Nicholas, in consequence, declared war against the Sultan, April 26th 1828. France and England remained idle spectators of this war, though a French army, under General Maison, was despatched to occupy the Morea. The Russians, under Wittgenstein, crossed the Pruth in May, captured Braila, June 19th, and Varna, October 11th, but were unable to pass the Balkan. This, however, was effected in the following summer by General Diebitsch, who, having taken Shumla, June 11th, crossed the mountains and appeared before Adrianople, which immediately surrendered. The Russian army in Asia, under Paskiewitsch, had also been successful, and the Porte, seeing the inutility of further resistance, signed the Peace of Adrianople, September 14th 1829. The stipulations of this treaty were little more than a confirmation of that of Bucharest, except that the Hospodars of Moldavia and Wallachia were to be appointed for life, and no Turks were to reside in those principalities. The most important article was that by which the Porte acceded to the provisions of the Treaty of London with regard to the Greeks. But two or three years were still to elapse before the final settlement of the Greek kingdom, during which Capodistrias governed in the interest of Russia. He had, however, to contend with conspiracies and insurrections. The little Greek fleet was burnt by Miaulis, July 30th 1831, to prevent his using it in the Russian interest, and shortly after Capodistrias was assassinated (October 9th). He was succeeded in the Government

by his younger brother Augustine. Meanwhile the ministers of the five Powers at London were endeavouring to establish the Greek kingdom. The proffered crown was declined by Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg; but at last King Louis of Bavaria, whose poetical temperament rendered him an enthusiastic Philhellenist, accepted it for his younger son Otho, May 7th 1832. The distinguished Hellenist and Homeric scholar, Thiersch, had visited Greece in the preceding year, and warped perhaps by his favourite studies, as well as by his own amiable temper, had beheld everything in a favourable light. The National Assembly of the Greeks recognised Otho for their king, August 8th, and a Provisional Government of Bavarian ministers was appointed till he should take possession of the throne. Otho landed at Nauplia, February 5th 1833; but it was not till June 1st 1835 that he took the government into his own hands, when he removed his residence to Athens. In the interval, the Bavarian Government had had to contend with many difficulties and insurrections, which continued under the new king.

M. de Martignac, and the Liberal French ministry which had assisted the Greek cause, had been dismissed before the Peace of Adrianople. M. de Martignac had never enjoyed the King's confidence. On July 30th 1829, the Chambers were dissolved, and a few days after the ministry received their dismissal. Nothing could be more impolitic than the choice of their successors. Prince Jules de Polignac, a most unpopular person, was now appointed head of the ministry. The selection of his colleagues was still worse. M. Labourdonnaye, detested for the harshness and severity of his character, received the portfolio of the Interior. But the most injudicious appointment of all was that of General Bourmont, as Minister-at-war, who was hated and contemned by the nation for his desertion to the allies just before the battle of Waterloo. The installation of this ministry was hailed with a universal shout of disapprobation. Alarming symptoms appeared in the provinces. A union to resist all unconstitutional taxes began in Brittany, and soon spread throughout France. The revolutionary society called *Aide-toi* was instituted, and Lafayette began to agitate in several of the provincial towns, especially Lyon, where he was received with tumultuous applause.

The Chambers were reopened, March 2nd 1830. The King, in his opening speech, expressed his determination to maintain the privileges of the Crown, and to repress all attempts to overthrow them. In this assembly appeared M. Guizot, as leader of the party called, from their somewhat pedantic constitutional system,

the *Doctrinaires*. The Chamber of Deputies complained, in an address to the Throne, of the Government's want of confidence in the people. Symptoms of opposition were also displayed in the Chamber of Peers, where Chateaubriand thundered against the ministry, and even the Duke of Fitz-James, who, though a favourite of the King's, was an enemy of Polignac's. Montbel, one of the ministers, advised the King to dissolve the Chambers, and appeal to the people by a manifest; though the majority of the ministry counselled moderation. It was thought that some popularity might be gained by an expedition against Algiers, which piratical State, under the Dey Hussein Bey, had infested the commerce of France, plundered her settlements, insulted her consul, and fired on the ship of an officer sent to demand redress. But the British Government was opposed to the expedition; a large English fleet was despatched into the Mediterranean, and it became necessary for the French to obtain the consent of England to the enterprise. This circumstance, as well as the appointment of General Bourmont to the command of the expedition, deprived it of all merit in the eyes of the nation. The fleet was to sail from Toulon, May 16th; on that day the Chambers were dissolved, and the new ones were to meet early in August. At the same time a partial change was made in the ministry. But the expedition was not so successful as had been hoped. It was detained by storms, and at the outset two brigs fell into the hands of the Algerines. This was all the news that arrived during the elections, in which the society *Aide-toi*, and the *Comité directeur*, under Lafayette, busied themselves against the Crown. The result was, that a Chamber was returned still more hostile to the Government than the former one. When the elections were completed, news arrived that Algiers had capitulated, July 4th; a victory, however, which, though announced with great pomp, had no effect whatever on the nation. A grand *Te Deum* was appointed to be performed, and Bourmont was made a Marshal of France; but the people flocked to the Palais Royal, to pay their homage to the Duke of Orleans. It became evident that either the Chambers or the King must fall. Under these circumstances, the Government resorted to an extraordinary measure. The 14th Article of the Charter provided that the King might issue ordinances necessary for the execution of the laws and the safety of the State. Availing themselves of this Article, the French ministers published, July 25th, the celebrated and fatal ordinances of St. Cloud, by which the freedom of the press was suspended, a number of Liberal journals suppressed, the law of election altered,

by diminishing the number of electors and raising the qualification; the Chambers, which had not yet met, were again dissolved, and new Chambers appointed to meet, September 28th. Further ordinances named a considerable number of councillors of state, selected from the ultra-Royalist party. Yet this violent *coup d'état* had been adopted without taking the necessary military precautions to insure its success. The troops in Paris numbered only 12,000 men, and these had been placed under the command of Marmont, who was hardly to be trusted.

The ordinances appeared in the *Moniteur*, July 26th. The tumult and agitation in Paris were extreme. Groups assembled in the streets; daily labour was suspended; all master printers or manufacturers, of Liberal politics, closed their workshops, as if by common accord. In the evening the windows of Prince Polignac's hotel were broken by the mob. On the following day a protest against the ordinances appeared in nearly all the Liberal journals. It was now that M. Thiers first prominently appeared, who was to rise from the calling of a journalist to one of the first offices of the State. The *gens d'armes* who were directed to destroy the presses of the Liberal newspapers met with a determined resistance at the office of the *Temps*, and could with difficulty find a locksmith to open the doors. Collisions occurred between the mob and the *gens d'armes*; the more timid citizens closed their shops. It was between five and six o'clock in the evening before the troops appeared; but the sight of them only increased the rage of the people, who began to assail them with stones, tiles, and other missiles. Meanwhile the Liberal deputies having assembled at the house of Casimir Périer, drew up a protest denying the King's right to dismiss Chambers which had not yet met, and declaring all new elections under the ordinances illegal. The night was spent in arming. It was arranged that the disbanded National Guard should reappear in uniform on the following day, and thus give the insurrection an appearance of legality. The pupils of the Polytechnic School mingled with the people, and Lafayette arrived in Paris from the country.

While these things were going on, the ministers had assembled at Prince Polignac's, and had resolved to declare Paris in a state of siege, to send for troops from the provinces, and to arrest the deputies who had signed the protest. But they were not strong enough to carry out these measures. Marmont had not disposed even the few troops he had so as effectively to hinder the operations of the people. The King, at this critical juncture, had gone to hunt at Rambouillet!

On the 28th, the men of the Faubourg St. Antoine, interspersed with a few National Guards, took possession of the Hôtel de Ville, and hoisted on the roof the three-coloured flag, which was also displayed in most of the streets. Marmont, who had expressed his disapprobation of the ordinances, and had undertaken the command unwillingly, wrote to the King, advising him to negociate; but Charles, instead of either dismissing him or following his advice, ordered him to resist. Marmont now directed two columns against the Hôtel de Ville; but many of the soldiers began to fraternize with the mob, and only the Swiss guards did their duty. The Liberal deputies having assembled at the house of Audry de Puyravaux, debated whether they should turn the revolt into a revolution. Puyravaux himself, supported by Lafayette, Lafitte, and others, was for that course; while Casimir Périer, General Sebastiani, and Guizot advocated constitutional measures and another protest. At length it was resolved to send a deputation, headed by Lafitte and Arago, to Marmont, to require that all further effusion of blood should be arrested. Marmont now again advised the King to yield. But Charles would make no concessions, and Marmont was directed to concentrate his troops in the neighbourhood of the Tuileries. Reinforcements were anxiously expected. But the line of telegraphs had been intercepted, and the messages despatched to St. Omer and Lunéville to bring up troops by forced marches came too late. On July 29th, the people had obtained possession of all Paris, except the quarter of the Tuileries, where Marmont maintained his ground, but not without considerable bloodshed. Lafayette having, at the request of the deputies, assumed the command of the National Guard, fixed his headquarters at the Hôtel de Ville, whence he issued a proclamation calling on the people to achieve their liberty or die. On the evening of the 29th the people succeeded in getting possession of the Tuileries, and were thus entirely masters of the metropolis. They acted for the most part with moderation and forbearance, though they plundered the Archbishop's palace. The number of the slain seems to have been about 700.

Consternation reigned among the courtiers at St. Cloud. As happens in such conjunctures, advice of the most various kinds was tendered to the King. Most were for making concessions. Many gave up the King for lost, and thought only of saving the dynasty by proclaiming the Duke of Bordeaux and a regency. All seemed to have lost their heads, except Guernon de Ranville. That minister had at first advised moderation; now he dissuaded from all concession, because it was too late. The only course, for the King,

he contended, was to fly to some loyal province, to rally round him what troops remained faithful, as well as a loyal Chamber. He might then negociate with success, which at present, after his troops had been beaten, was impossible. But this sensible advice was supported only by the Duke of Angoulême. Charles yielded to the advocates of concession. Polignac was dismissed, and the Duke de Mortemar, who had served in the army of Napoleon, and had lately represented France at the Court of St. Petersburg, was appointed in his place. Mortemar, in conjunction with Vitrolles and D'Argout, proceeded to draw up some new ordinances, in which a few necessary concessions were made; and he appointed Casimir Périer to the finances, and General Gérard, Minister-at-War. Charles, who, after a hand at whist, had gone to bed and to sleep, was awakened, and, after some little hesitation, signed these concessions, with which De Sémonville, Vitrolles, and D'Argout hastened to Paris.

On the morning of the 31st, what was called a *Municipal Commission* was instituted and installed at the Hôtel de Ville, to watch over the public safety. Its members were, Lafayette, Casimir Périer, Lafitte, Gérard, Puyravaux, Lobau, Von Schonen, and Manguin. The Commission proceeded to name some ministers: Odillon Barrot as general secretary, Gérard as commander of the forces, Lafayette as commandant of the National Guard. The authority of the new board was universally recognised. In fact, the revolution seemed to be accomplished, as nearly all the troops of the line had joined the people, while the guards had retired to St. Cloud. Such was the state of things at Paris when De Sémonville arrived to announce the withdrawal of the unpopular ordinances and the appointment of a new ministry. The Municipal Commission refused to listen to him; Von Schonen coldly observed, "It is too late; the throne has fallen in blood." De Sémonville, after the failure of a similar attempt with the deputies at the house of Lafitte, returned in despair to St. Cloud to relate his ill success. Mortemar now proceeded to Paris to try what he could do with the more moderate party; but having equally failed, he vanished, to reappear a few days after in the antechamber of the Duke of Orleans.

Louis Philippe had apparently taken no part in the movement. He had spent the whole summer at his seat at Neuilly in the bosom of his numerous family; but in this retirement he had been secretly making a party, among whom may be named Talleyrand, Lafitte, and Thiers. These men persuaded the deputies that they could not do better than raise Louis Philippe to the throne. The

Parisian populace, who had long looked upon him as their friend, would offer no opposition; Talleyrand, who enjoyed a great reputation in the courts of Europe, would reconcile them to the change of dynasty; the *bourgeoisie* of the National Guard, with their leader Lafayette, would acquiesce. Of the two parties from whom opposition might be expected, the Royalists had been conquered, while the Bonapartists and Republicans knew not how to use their sudden and unexpected victory. A proclamation, drawn up by Thiers, was posted on the walls of Paris, recommending the Duke of Orleans, who had fought at Jemappes, as the "Citizen King." The deputies having met in the Palais Bourbon, signed a paper requesting the Duke of Orleans to undertake the government of the kingdom, with the title of Lieutenant-General, and to uphold the three-coloured flag till the Chambers should have fully assured the realisation of the Charter.

The Duke of Orleans entered Paris on foot, July 30th, like a private gentleman. His first care was to see Talleyrand. He had no doubts about the Parisians. His only anxiety was how foreign Governments might regard the revolution; and when Talleyrand had satisfied him on this point, he no longer hesitated. He sent the same night for the Duke of Mortemar, who undertook to carry to the King a letter in which Louis Philippe still spoke of his fidelity! Charles was deceived by it. So little did he imagine that the Duke of Orleans would betray him, that on July 31st he named that prince by a formal patent Lieutenant-General of the kingdom, and requested him in a letter to maintain the rights of the Crown. The Duke now published a proclamation concluding with the words: "In future a charter will be a truth." The deputies also made a separate proclamation, in which they pledged themselves to procure the legal establishment of certain rights which they specified. In order to obtain the support of the Municipal Commission, the Duke of Orleans proceeded, at the head of the deputies, to the Hôtel de Ville. He won Lafayette's heart by exclaiming: "You see, gentlemen, an old National Guard, who is come to visit his former general." An agreement was speedily concluded in the brief phrase, "A popular throne with republican institutions." Lafayette then embraced the Duke, and, conducting him to the balcony, placed him under a three-coloured flag, as the man of the people.

The new Lieutenant-General now proceeded to name a ministry selected from all parties, except the Royalists. Among them were Dupont de l'Eure, who inclined to the Republicans; Guizot, the representative of the *Doctrinaires*; Lafitte, Louis Philippe's

confidant; Baron Louis, the favourite of Talleyrand; Bignon, a Bonapartist; the Duke de Broglie, to show the aristocrats that they would not be excluded from the new *régime*; General Gérard, and Admiral Rigny. Thus was completed the "Revolution of July," called also the *Grande Semaine*, and from the superior importance of the 27th, 28th, and 29th, the "Three Days."

On July 31st, Charles X. quitted St. Cloud for Trianon. During this short march he was deserted by some of his guards. At Trianon, De Ranville repeated his advice to the King to fly to Tours, and assemble a Chamber in that city. But Charles still relied on the Duke of Orleans, and was for waiting till he should hear from him. The anxiety of the Duchess of Berri was, however, so great that she induced the King to proceed on the following day to Rambouillet, where they were joined by the Duchess of Angoulême. The soldiers now began to desert in troops. A letter having at length arrived from the Duke of Orleans, purporting that the King had become too unpopular to retain the crown, Charles published an ordinance announcing his abdication in favour of his grandson the Duke of Bordeaux, whom he proclaimed as Henry V., and calling on the Lieutenant-General to conduct the Regency in the name of the young King (August 2nd).

But Louis Philippe had other views. In his speech to the Chambers, though he announced the abdication of the King, and the Dauphin's renunciation of his rights to the throne, he forbore to mention that these things had been done in favour of the Duke of Bordeaux. He refused to receive any communications from the King, and repulsed all who came to him on the King's behalf. He saw that he could reckon on the majority of the Parisians. Advocates for a Republic could be found only among some of the lowest class. The middle classes would not hear of it, though at the same time they saw that the old line of the Bourbons could not remain. Louis Philippe now began to take measures for driving Charles and his family from France. Marshal Maison, Odillon Barrot, and Von Schonen were sent, as if officially, and by order of the Lieutenant-General and the Deputies, to accompany the King over the frontier. On their arrival at Rambouillet, they found the King asleep; but Marmont told them that, for such a step, it was necessary to have a written order from the Duke of Orleans, and the Commissaries hastened back to Paris to procure one. The Duke displayed excitement and displeasure at their return, exclaiming, "He must go! he must go!" It was determined to effect the King's expulsion by means of the Parisian

mob. Before break of day an insurrection was organised; the word was given "To Rambouillet!" and arms were distributed to the people; who were to march thither, and compel the unfortunate King and his family to fly. Marshal Maison, who with his fellow Commissaries had driven back to Rambouillet, told Charles that the people of Paris were marching against him. When the truth at last stared the old King in the face, he gave vent to such an ebullition of rage that Maison was glad to hasten from his presence. But 60,000 men were marching on Rambouillet; and Charles, having no means of resistance, at length consented to go into exile. The Commissaries gave him a military escort to Cherbourg, where he embarked for England. Nothing could exceed the respect with which the unfortunate monarch was treated during this journey by all ranks of the people. In England, the royal fugitives were at first received at Lulworth Castle, in Dorsetshire, and subsequently took up their abode, for the second time, at the palace of Holyrood, at Edinburgh, which had been placed at their disposal by the English Government. Great Britain was now under the sceptre of William IV.; his brother, George IV., having expired, after a long illness, June 26th 1830.

Louis Philippe opened the Legislature August 3rd. The Chamber of Deputies drew up a declaration in which the throne was announced to be vacant, through the abdication of the elder branch of the Bourbons, and the principles were promulgated on which the new throne was to be held. Many alterations and additions were made in the existing Charter; of which the following are the most important:—The Roman Catholic religion was to be no longer the dominant one, but all confessions were put on an equal footing: the censorship was abolished, and unconditional freedom of the press established: the new King was to have no power to suspend a law, nor to appoint special commissioners in order to supersede the usual tribunals: no foreigners were to be admitted into the French military service: every Frenchman of the age of twenty-five to be an elector, and at the age of thirty capable of being elected a deputy: the peers named by Charles X. were abolished, and the sittings of that chamber were to be public: the Chambers, as well as the King, to have the privilege of proposing laws: the King to be called "King of the French:" and the three-coloured flag to be substituted for the white one (August 7th).

The Chamber of Deputies, under the presidency of Lafitte, chose the Duke of Orleans for King by 219 votes against 33; 39 members abstained from voting. When Lafitte and the deputies proceeded to the Palais Royal to announce their resolution,

Louis Philippe affected to complain that it was highly disagreeable to him to be withdrawn from domestic life, but, from love to his country, he would make the required sacrifice. Then, supported by Lafitte and Lafayette, he showed himself in the balcony of his palace, and was received by the people with cries of *Vive le Roi*! In these proceedings the Chamber of Peers was not consulted. Chateaubriand was the only peer who had the courage to maintain the rights of the Duke of Bordeaux; but he was supported by only nineteen of his colleagues.

The new King was inthroned, August 9th, at the Palais Bourbon, where the deputies held their sittings. Casimir Périer having read the declaration of August 7th, and Baron Pasquier the accession to it of the Peers, the Duke of Orleans took an oath to observe it, and ascended the throne as Louis Philippe, amid the acclamations of the Assembly. The new King applied himself to acquire popularity among the Parisians, by displaying himself as a "Citizen King." Anybody and everybody was admitted to his presence in pantaloons and boots; he appeared in the streets on foot, in a greatcoat and round hat, with the proverbial umbrella under his arm, and shook hands familiarly with the people. The church of St. Geneviève became once more the Pantheon, and Voltaire and Rousseau were again adored. But Louis Philippe displayed his prudence by relinquishing to his children, on the day of his accession, all the estates of the House of Orleans, so that they became private property, and could not be forfeited with the crown. France, as usual, acquiesced in the proceedings of the capital; though there were some slight disturbances at Nîmes and in La Vendée.

The news of the French Revolution ran through Europe like an electric shock, firing all the elements of discontent which lay lurking in various quarters. Belgium, unwillingly united to Holland by the policy of the Allies to encircle France with powerful states, first felt the explosion. Many were the elements of discord between those two countries. They spoke different languages, had different customs and manners, and opposite commercial interests. The Dutch were rigid Calvinists, the Belgians bigoted Catholics, and hence the two peoples felt for each other all the bitterness of religious hate. In this state of things a desire had sprung up in Belgium for a union with France, where, under the reign of Charles X., the Catholic Church again flourished. The Belgians also complained that they were saddled with part of the burthen of the enormous national debt of Holland, that they contributed to the building of Dutch ships, the maintenance of Dutch dykes,

and other objects, from which they derived no benefit whatever. Their discontent was increased by the unpopular government of King William I., who treated Belgium like a conquered country.

Already before the breaking out of the French Revolution, symptoms of insurrection had appeared at Brussels, on occasion of the prosecution of De Potter, a political writer, towards the end of 1828. A serious riot had also occurred at the Catholic College of Louvain, in February 1830. After the disturbances in France, William I. thought it prudent to make some concessions to the Belgians, but they failed to give satisfaction. On the night of August 25th, the revolt broke out. The opera of the *Muette de Portici*, which turns on the revolt of Masaniello, was represented that evening, the incidents of which were vociferously applauded. After the performance, the mob broke into, plundered and even burnt the houses of some of the more unpopular ministers. Next day the old Brabant colours, red, orange, and black, were hoisted on the Town House. The troops were now called out, but having no orders, did not act with decision, and were driven back into their barracks. From this period the insurrection ran its natural course almost without opposition. A national guard was formed, and succeeded in keeping down the mob, but not without some bloodshed. On the 28th of August, forty of the principal inhabitants of Brussels assembled, and having chosen Baron Secus as their president, and the advocate Van de Weyer as secretary, despatched a deputation to the Hague, to request the King to make the concessions, which had been so long desired. But William I. was not disposed to give way. He employed his eldest son to soothe the people with promises, whilst his brother, Prince Frederick, assembled at Vilvorde as many troops as possible. On the 31st, the two princes required the national guard of Brussels to strike the national colours, and restore the custody of the city to the King's troops. This demand increased the prevailing irritation. The example of the capital had spread into the provinces. At Verviers, dreadful excesses had been committed, and many labourers had repaired to Brussels, to settle the question in the capital. On the night of September 1st, barricades were thrown up in the streets to prevent the entrance of the troops. The Prince of Orange now came to Brussels alone, stepped into the midst of the armed masses, and promised that a commission should be immediately appointed, to consult with himself about the measures to be adopted. But this proceeding gave no satisfaction, and a proclamation issued by the commission was publicly burnt. The Prince now proposed a legislative and administrative

separation of Belgium from Holland; in short, merely a union under the same crown. This concession appeared to give universal satisfaction; it was even supported by the people of Amsterdam; but the King would decide nothing till the meeting of the States-General, which were to assemble at the Hague, September 13th. But when the States met, nothing was done. The King even recalled Van Maanen, an unpopular minister, who had been dismissed, and the Belgians began to suspect that they had been deceived.

The revolt now assumed a more democratic and violent form. The impulse came from Liége. On September 15th the Liégeois rose, and after dispersing the burgher-guard, drove out the King's troops. The boldest of these insurgents then proceeded to Brussels, where they led an attack on the Dutch troops. On September 20th, they headed the people in disarming the national guard; after which all the depôts of arms were seized, the public buildings occupied, the public boards cashiered, and a Provisional Government was established, of which De Potter, who was then at Paris, was appointed the head. On September 23rd, Prince Frederick attacked Brussels with 6000 or 7000 men; but though he penetrated into the town and occupied the upper part of it, as the Rue Royale, the Park, &c., he found that he was not strong enough to maintain those positions, and on the night of the 26th he was compelled to retire.

In these and the following days the Dutch troops were driven from most of the towns of Belgium, while the Belgian soldiery declared for the national cause. Antwerp, Maestricht, Mechlin, Dendermonde, and the citadel of Ghent alone remained in the hands of the Dutch. Now, when it was too late, the States-General at the Hague sanctioned by a large majority the legislative and administrative separation of Holland and Belgium, September 29th. But the victorious Belgians refused to listen to any terms. De Potter had arrived in Brussels, and assumed the direction of the Provisional Government; which on October 5th proclaimed the independence of Belgium, appointed a Commission to draw up a Constitution, convoked a National Congress at Brussels, and annulled whatever the Belgian deputies had done in the States-General at the Hague without the knowledge of the Provisional Government. On the 9th, the House of Orange-Nassau was declared to have forfeited, by its late proceedings, all its claims on Belgium; and the Prince of Orange, who had proclaimed himself the head of the separated Belgian administration, was pronounced to have no right to the regency, unless he should be elected by the National Congress. In the elections for that assembly, however,

the moderate party had prevailed; even De Potter himself was not returned; and the Prince of Orange, encouraged by this circumstance, issued another proclamation, October 16th, in which, as if resolved to carry out the revolution in spite of his father, he recognised the independence of Belgium, and, as he expressed it, "placed himself at the head of the movement." But the Provisional Government answered this appeal by recommending him to interfere no further in their affairs.

It was the wish of the Belgian liberals to be united to France. But such a union was displeasing to the European Powers; and Louis Philippe, whose own usurpation was hardly yet consolidated, ventured not to offend them by encouraging the Belgian revolution. He procured the recognition of some of the Powers by engaging neither to suffer a republic in Belgium nor to unite that country with France; a proposition which had been made to him by the Belgians through Gendebien. But at the same time he bade the great Powers remark that they must abstain from undertaking anything against Belgian independence, or that he should not be able to restrain the public opinion of France. Russia was at first inclined to support King William; but all at length concurred in the views of Louis Philippe, and the principle of non-intervention was for the first time unanimously recognised. A conference of ministers, with regard to Belgian affairs, was opened at London, November 4th, composed of Talleyrand, Lord Aberdeen, Prince Esterhazy, Von Bülow, and Count Mutusszewitsch.

The London Congress recognised the Independence of Belgium, December 20th. This act, and the recognition of Louis Philippe, were the first blows struck at the principle of legitimacy asserted by the Holy Alliance, and maintained at all preceding conferences since the Congress of Vienna. In both these acts Great Britain had taken the lead. The Belgian National Congress, which had been opened at Brussels November 10th, determined that it must proceed hand in hand with the Congress in London. But William I. was not inclined to relinquish what he could hold; consequently the war went on, and while the Congresses were sitting several battles occurred in the neighbourhood of Maestricht, and in the Duchy of Luxembourg. The London Congress assigned to Holland the limits which it had possessed in 1790, with the addition of Luxembourg, and it imposed upon Belgium part of the Dutch debt. With this arrangement King William declared himself satisfied; but the Brussels Congress protested against it, February 1st 1831; and William, therefore, continued to retain possession of Antwerp.

The Belgian Congress voted a new Constitution, February 7th, which was to consist of a king and two representative chambers. The choice of a sovereign occasioned some difficulty. Among the candidates named were the Prince of Orange, the Duke of Nemours, and the Duke of Leuchtenberg. The London Conference proposed Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, who was at length accepted by the Brussels Congress, June 4th 1831. Leopold made his solemn entry into Brussels, July 21st, and took the oath to the new Constitution. But he was not to enjoy his new dignity without dispute. King William had silently collected a large army, with which the Prince of Orange suddenly entered Belgium while Leopold was absent on a tour in the provinces. The Belgian Provisional Government, confident that the great Powers would not suffer the armistice to be broken, had neglected the army, and the mob who had been victorious in the towns were no match for disciplined troops in the open field. The Prince of Orange proclaimed that he came not to conquer Belgium, but only to obtain more advantageous conditions. Advancing upon Liége, he defeated the Belgians under General Niellon at Turnhout, August 3rd, and on the 8th overthrew, near Hasselt, General Daine and the larger portion of the Belgian army. A Dutch division proceeded to Antwerp to reinforce General Chassé, repulsed the Belgians under General Tiecke, in whose camp Leopold was, and, breaking down the dykes, laid a large portion of Flanders under water. Duke Bernhard of Saxe Weimar, whom King William had appointed Governor of Luxembourg, now threw himself between Louvain and Brussels, thus cutting off Leopold from his capital, while the Prince of Orange was advancing against him with superior forces. The two rivals met at Tirlemont, August 11th. A great part of Leopold's army was composed of men in blouses, who fled at the first onset. A few companies of the Brussels national guard ventured to oppose the Dutch, but were too weak, and the whole army fled in disorder to Louvain. That place surrendered at the first summons of the Dutch, but Leopold escaped to Mechlin.

Meanwhile a French army of 50,000 men, under Marshal Gérard, who was accompanied by Louis Philippe's two eldest sons, entered Belgium, to which step Talleyrand had obtained the consent of the English Ministry. An English fleet under Admiral Codrington also appeared in the Scheldt. Béliard and Adair, the French and English negociators, proceeded to the Dutch camp, when the Prince of Orange consented to an armistice, and the forces on all sides retired to their former positions, August 12th. The Dutch, by this demonstration, and through Russian influence, succeeded in obtain-

ing more favourable conditions. It was decided that Belgium should cede part of Limbourg, as well as Luxembourg, and take upon itself yearly 8,400,000 guilders of the Dutch debt. King William, however, would not consent to the new articles, in the hope that, when the Czar had put down the revolution in Poland, he should be assisted by Russia, as well as by the German Powers. But in this expectation he was disappointed.

In May 1832 King Leopold proceeded to France, and in an interview with Louis Philippe at Compiègne, obtained the hand of his eldest daughter, Louisa. The marriage was celebrated in the following August, when Leopold assured the Belgians that his children should be educated in the Catholic faith. As the King of the Netherlands had not yet consented to the conditions proposed, an embargo was laid upon Dutch vessels in England, and a French army was set in motion to drive the Dutch from Antwerp. As William I. declared that he would yield only to force, an English fleet under Admiral Malcolm began to blockade the Dutch coast early in November, and about the middle of that month the French laid siege to Antwerp. Chassé made a brave defence, and did not surrender till the citadel was reduced to a heap of rubbish, December 23rd. Even then William refused to accept the capitulation, or to abandon the forts Lillo and Liefkenshoek. At length, on May 21st 1833, a preliminary treaty was signed; but it was not till January 22nd 1839 that Holland consented, by a definitive treaty, to accept the London Protocol!

The Russian autocrat, the main prop of legitimacy in Europe, found himself called upon to support his own authority at home. At the news of the outbreak in France, Nicholas contemplated suppressing it by force, and the Russian officers talked familiarly of a promenade to Paris. But the irritation of the Czar was somewhat soothed by the elevation of Louis Philippe to a constitutional throne, and his attention was soon after diverted from the affairs of France by a revolt among his Polish subjects. In 1829 Nicholas had received the crown of Poland at Warsaw. All had then appeared tranquil in that subject kingdom, but the elements of discontent lay festering under the surface. Society still consisted only of a proud and restless nobility and a peasantry of slaves; nor had the causes of Poland's former misfortunes been removed by the Constitution given to it by the Emperor Alexander after the model of the French Charter. The misery of the Poles was increased by the harshness of the Grand Duke Constantine's government, who ruled like a Tartar Prince. The revolution began by a conspiracy of some young Polish students and subalterns to seize Constantine

at the Belvedere, a residence of the Prince's in the vicinity of Warsaw; when it was expected that the Polish troops in that city, who numbered 10,000 men, would rise and drive out the Russian garrison of 7000. With these views, twenty young men proceeded in the dusk of evening, on November 29th 1830, to the Belvedere, where they killed General Gendre and the Vice-president Lubowicki; but Constantine escaped by concealing himself in a garret. Meanwhile the citizens of Warsaw had risen *en masse*, armed themselves at the arsenal, and seized many of the Russian officers in the theatre: the Polish soldiers had joined the people, and murdered General Stanislaus Potocki and others of their officers who refused to renounce their allegiance. The defection of the Polish soldiery gave great strength to the movement. The insurrection was now joined by many persons of distinction. General Cholpicki, who had distinguished himself in the wars of Napoleon, assumed the chief command, and eventually a sort of absolute dictatorship. He was supported, among others, by Prince Lubecki, Professor Lelewel, Count Ostrowski, and Prince Adam Czartoryski. The last, a descendant of the ancient Princes of Lithuania, and related to the Russian Imperial family, had been a favourite of the Emperor Alexander's, and the Poles, in case of success, had marked him out for their future king. Constantine had referred to the Imperial court a deputation which had waited upon him with a statement of their claims and grievances; but Nicholas would hear of nothing but unconditional submission, and early in 1831 a large Russian army, commanded by Diebitsch, prepared to reduce the Poles to obedience. At the command of the Emperor, Cholpicki had laid down his dictatorship in January; but the Poles, headed by Czartoryski, pursued the insurrection more vigorously than ever. Prince Radzivill was appointed commander-in-chief of their forces in place of Cholpicki. Diebitsch, having issued a proclamation which left the Poles no choice between slavish submission or destruction, the Diet declared, January 25th, that Nicholas had forfeited the Polish crown; and they prepared to support their resolution by all the means in their power. The army was raised to between 50,000 and 60,000 men; but a great portion of them was armed only with scythes. Negociations were entered into with foreign Powers; and in order to conciliate them, it was resolved, February 3rd, that Poland should be governed by a constitutional monarchy. But the Poles were disappointed in their hopes of foreign support. Louis Philippe only used the Polish insurrection to induce Nicholas to recognise his own accession, and the independence of Belgium, while England and Austria afforded the Poles no substantial aid.

Diebitsch, who had collected an army of 114,000 men, with 336 guns, at Bialystok and Grodno, crossed the Polish frontier February 5th. We cannot enter into the details of the insurrectionary war. It must suffice to state that the Poles, though aided by an insurrection in Lithuania, were compelled to yield, after an heroic defence, to superior numbers and discipline. The cholera had ravaged the armies of both sides. Diebitsch died of it June 10th, and on July 18th, the Grand Duke Constantine, at Minsk. Warsaw surrendered September 8th to Paskiewitsch, who had succeeded Diebitsch in the command, and on the 28th of the same month, the Russian general Rüdiger entered Cracow. The Polish divisions in the provinces were speedily dispersed, and before the end of autumn the insurrection was entirely quelled. Paskiewitsch, who was made Prince and Governor of Warsaw, re-established the Russian regimen. An amnesty was indeed granted November 1st, but with so many exceptions that hardly anybody was safe. Paskiewitsch directed his efforts to abolish the nationality of Poland and to reduce it as much as possible to a Russian province. The University of Warsaw was suppressed, the archives, libraries, scientific collections, &c., were removed to St. Petersburg, the Polish uniform and colours were abolished, and the Polish soldiery incorporated in Russian regiments. Prince Radzivill and other leading Poles were relegated to the interior of the Empire, and it is computed that in 1832, 80,000 Poles were sent into Siberia. In that dreadful banishment, individuals are almost deprived of their identity; they lose not only their rank but even their very name, and are no longer known but by a number! Polish children were snatched from their parents and carried into what are called the military colonies of Russia; the Roman Catholic Church was persecuted agreeably to the Czar's Græco-Russian system; and on February 26th 1832, Poland was declared a Russian province.

Even the inert mass of the German Confederation was partially stirred by the July Revolution! The most characteristic trait of German history at this period is that the so-called constitutions moulded on the French Charter, which had been bestowed on some of the minor states, were established by Russian influence. But Russia had set her face against a Prussian Constitution. The establishment of a *Zollverein*, or customs union between Bavaria and Würtemberg, subsequently adopted by other German states, seemed a step towards German unity. But the partial revolutions which occurred in Germany in 1830, were more calculated to confirm the ancient state of things than to lead to such a consummation. In Saxony, the old King, Frederick Augustus, had died

in May, 1827, and had been succeeded by his brother Anthony. No line of princes was more bigoted to the old order of things than the House of Wettin; and the circumstance that while the royal family professed the Roman Catholic religion, their subjects were Protestants, augmented the danger of collision. In June, 1830, a few days before the breaking out of the French Revolution, the citizens of Dresden and the University of Leipsic had wished to celebrate the Jubilee of the Augsburg Confession; but the demonstration was suppressed in order not to give offence to the Court. This proceeding occasioned disturbances which had not been quelled when the news of the July Revolution arrived in Saxony. Serious riots ensued both in Leipsic and Dresden, in which latter capital the Council House and police buildings were burnt. In order to allay the storm, King Anthony found himself compelled to adopt his son, Frederick Augustus, who was very popular, as co-regent, to dismiss his minister Einsiedel, and to make some improvements in the Constitution. Insurrections also broke out in Brunswick, where the tyrannical Duke Charles was deposed in favour of his brother William; and in electoral Hesse, where William II. abdicated in favour of his son, Frederick William. Disturbances likewise occurred in Hesse Darmstadt, Baden and other minor States, as well as in Switzerland, where reforms were effected in several cantons. Prussia and Austria proper were little affected by the French Revolution of 1830. But it gave an impulse to the awakening nationality of the Hungarians. When in November, 1830, the Emperor Francis caused his son Ferdinand to be crowned King of Hungary, the Diet made much further demands than it had ever done before: namely, that the Magyar tongue should in future be the official one instead of Latin; that Magyars only should be appointed to commands in Hungarian regiments, &c. The two *Tables*, that is, the upper and lower Houses of the Diet, or the Magnates and the States, now introduced the use of the Magyar language in their debates. In consequence of these proceedings, the Diet was not again assembled till 1832, when Louis Kossuth first appeared as the *ablegat*, or proxy of an absent noble.

After the overthrow of Charles X., Mina, Valdez, and hundreds of Spanish liberals who had sought refuge in France, made an irruption into Spain. Louis Philippe at first supported them. He assured Lafayette, who took a great interest in their success, of his favourable views towards them, and even gave him money in support of their cause. But, as in the case of Belgium and Poland, his interest in their success only extended so far as it

might affect his own political interests, and he treacherously abandoned them to their fate as soon as Ferdinand VII. acknowledged the new dynasty. The minister Molé had warned the Spanish emigrants of their danger. They were already on the frontiers when Louis Philippe sent orders to disarm them. They preferred, however, to enter Spain, but were speedily defeated at every point by superior forces. It was with the greatest difficulty that Mina, after wandering several days in the mountains, succeeded in escaping back to France. Italy was not at this time disturbed, though insurrections, which we shall relate further on, broke out in the following year. Pope Pius VII. had died in 1823, and was succeeded by the Cardinal della Genga, with the title of Leo XII., an old man of seventy-four. Genga ruled severely and kept down the *Carbonari*. On his death in 1829, Cardinal Castiglione was elected to the vacant chair as Pope Pius VIII.

The reign of Louis Philippe, the "Citizen King," was without any fixed principles, and a continued system of trimming, both in his foreign and domestic policy. His first ministry, chosen from among the party which had triumphed in the "great week," consisted of Dupont de l'Eure, Lafitte, Gérard, Molé, Guizot, Broglie, Louis, Sébastiani, Casimir Périer and Dupin. Bignon, Napoleon's celebrated secretary, had also a place in it, but without a portfolio. Four of Charles X.'s ministers, Polignac, Peyronnet, Guernon de Ranville, and Chantelauze, had been arrested, and the populace clamoured loudly for their death. They were to be arraigned before the peers at the Luxembourg, December 15th, and the people threatened to enforce their execution. To avert disturbances, the King, under pretence of making preparations against foreign Powers, coloured by a false rumour that Russia and Prussia were to invade France, appointed Marshal Soult Minister-at-war, and directed him to organise a large force. The unpopularity, however, of acting against the people was left in the first instance to the National Guard under Lafayette, who, as usual, appeared on the side of order, defended the Luxembourg against the attacks of the mob, and captured some 400 of their more turbulent leaders. Lafayette having thus rendered himself unpopular, Louis Philippe found himself strong enough, with the support of Soult, to dismiss him from the command of the National Guard, and at the same time to disband the artillery, who had shown a disposition to fraternise with the mob. Dupont de l'Eure, fearing some similar trick, resigned, and was succeeded as head of the ministry by Lafitte. The ex-ministers of Charles X. were condemned to perpetual imprisonment, with loss of rank and civil rights.

Louis Philippe's domestic policy was necessarily in some degree reactionary, because the principles on which he had accepted the throne were untenable. Lafitte was dismissed in March 1831, and Casimir Périer then became prime minister, who immediately caused several noted republicans to be arrested. In his foreign policy, Louis Philippe endeavoured to acquire a little popularity without risking a breach with the great Powers. Thus in July 1831 he despatched a naval expedition against Don Miguel, in order to influence the elections then pending by the *éclat* of an easy victory. But as at the same time Poland was left unaided in the midst of her troubles, this manœuvre deceived nobody. The new Government was at once exposed to the intrigues and insurrections of the Carlists and of the republicans. Serious riots occurred at Lyon, Grenoble, and other places in the south of France. Republican demonstrations having been made at Paris on the occasion of General Lamarque's funeral, June 1st 1832, when barricades were erected and several persons killed, Paris was declared in a state of siege, by the advice, it is said, of M. Thiers. The Polytechnic School was now dissolved, and all suspected persons arrested, including the leaders of the legitimists, Chateaubriand, Fitzjames and Hyde de Neuville! but these last were speedily liberated. The Duchess of Berri, after attempting an insurrection in Provence in the spring of the year, passed through France to La Vendée, and endeavoured to raise the people in favour of her son the Duke of Bordeaux, or Henry V. Some bloody conflicts ensued between the insurgents and the royal troops; but the contest soon appeared hopeless, and the Duchess retired to Nantes. Here she was betrayed by one Deutz, a German Jew, in whom she had confided, and was discovered concealed behind the fireplace of a house at Nantes, Nov. 6th. Being found to be pregnant, she declared that she had been secretly married in Italy. She was brought to bed of a daughter at Blaye, May 10th 1833, when she affirmed that Count Luchesi Palli was the husband to whom she had been secretly united. The discovery of her dishonour having deprived her of any dangerous influence, Louis Philippe liberated her, June 8th, when she proceeded to Palermo. In the previous September Charles X. and his family had quitted Holyrood to take up their residence at Prague. This change was attributed to various motives. Some said that Charles was pursued by creditors, others that Metternich wished to have the Duke of Bordeaux as a pledge against the French usurper. Another claimant of the French throne, the Duke of Reichstadt, had been removed by death July 22nd 1832.

Fresh insurrections occurred at Lyon in the spring of 1834, which were not suppressed without considerable bloodshed. They were instigated by certain secret political societies, several of the leaders of which were brought to trial in May 1825, and condemned to imprisonment or transportation. On the 28th of July this year, on the celebration of the fifth anniversary of the July revolution, a diabolical attempt was made on the King's life by a wretch named Fieschi, who from the window of a small house on the Boulevard du Temple, discharged at Louis Philippe, while passing, what was called an "infernal machine," consisting of about a hundred gun-barrels fixed on a frame, and fired simultaneously by means of a train of gunpowder. Fortunately the King escaped unhurt, but a great many of his suite were either killed or wounded. Fieschi was arrested and guillotined. This attempt occasioned what were called the "Laws of September," to expedite the proceedings of the tribunals in cases of rebellion, and to curb the liberty of the press. M. Thiers, now Minister of the Interior, took a principal share in these proceedings, and scrupled not, in spite of the liberal doctrines which he so loudly professed when in opposition, to resort when in office to the most absolute and tyrannical measures. M. Guizot, who was his colleague in the Soult ministry, was distinguished from his rival by a more honourable and consistent conduct. In the following February M. Thiers became President of the Council and Secretary for Foreign Affairs. But in consequence of his views on the Spanish question, his ministry was dissolved after an existence of about half a year; when Count Molé became President, and M. Guizot was appointed Minister of Public Instruction. In June 1836 another abortive attempt was made on the King's life by a workman named Alibaud. In the same year, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, the future Emperor of the French, undertook his extraordinary and rash conspiracy at Strasburg; but before relating this attempt, we will briefly advert to the affairs of Italy, where Louis Napoleon had already made himself conspicuous by his participation in revolutionary movements.

Symptoms of revolt first showed themselves in the Italian States after the death of Pope Pius VIII. in 1831, and during the conclave which elected Cardinal Capillari to the vacant chair, with the title of Gregory XVI. Francis, Duke of Modena, detested for his absolutism and intolerance, and who is thought to have entertained the ambitious project of making himself King of Central Italy, was driven out by his subjects, and a Provisional Government established (February 1831). Singularly enough, this revolt was

led by Menotti, the head of the Modenese police, and a favourite of the Duke's. Bologna next felt the shock, where the Papal Prolegate was in like manner expelled, and a Provisional Government erected. In the same month, the Archduchess Maria Louisa, widow of Napoleon, was driven from her Duchy of Parma. Similar scenes occurred at Ferrara, Ancona, and Perugia. Napoleon Louis, and Charles Louis Napoleon, the sons of Louis Bonaparte King of Holland, were at this time residing at Florence, whence they corresponded with Menotti, the leader of the Modenese revolution. When the insurrection broke out in the Papal States, the two brothers joined the insurgents at Spoleto.

The advocate Vicini opened at Bologna, February 26th, what was called an Italian National Congress, with the avowed purpose of establishing the unity of Italy; and General Zucchi, who had served under Napoleon, but who had subsequently entered the Austrian service, endeavoured to organise a revolutionary army. But the Austrians put down these attempts with unwonted promptitude. An Austrian army under General Frimont entered the disturbed districts early in March, when the insurgents fled in all directions. After some feeble attempts at resistance, Zucchi was defeated, captured, and thrown into an Austrian dungeon, and the Austrians entered Bologna March 21st. Spoleto capitulated on the 30th, and the insurrection was at an end. The elder of the two sons of Louis Bonaparte died at Forlì, during the riots March 17th. The younger, Louis Napoleon, escaped disguised as a servant in the retinue of his mother, Hortense, whose anxiety for the safety of her sons had brought her to Spoleto.

The Italians relied without foundation on the aid of France. Louis Philippe had no idea of entering into a war with Austria for Italian liberty, though public opinion in France compelled him to some demonstrations on that side. Hence he exhorted the Pope to moderation, and on July 5th Gregory XVI. published an edict promising some reforms in the administration. These, however, did not satisfy the Italian people. They were encouraged by the opinion that the Austrians, who, with the exception of the citadel of Ferrara, had evacuated all the places they had entered, feared the intervention of the French, and the insurrection was resumed. At a meeting held at Bologna it was determined to convoke in that town another National Congress on January 5th 1832. The Pope assembled his troops at Rimini and Ferrara. The national guard of Bologna, under General Patuzzi, marched against them, but were defeated after a short combat at Cesena, January 20th. The Papal army, composed in great part of bandits, had committed

such disorders and cruelties, that Cardinal Albani, the Pope's representative, was ashamed to lead them against Bologna; and the Austrians were therefore called in once more. But so great was the clamour of the French liberals at this invasion, that Louis Philippe was compelled to make a demonstration by taking possession of Ancona. The act, however, was almost immediately disavowed, and on May 2nd the Papal troops were admitted into that place.

Neither Naples nor Sardinia was disturbed by these occurrences. The old King, Ferdinand IV. of Naples, who after his restoration had assumed the title of "Ferdinand I., King of the Two Sicilies," had died January 4th 1825, and was succeeded by his son Francis I. The latter monarch expired in November 1830. His son and successor, Ferdinand II., had rendered himself popular by introducing some reforms into the administration, and by liberating political prisoners. In Sardinia, Charles Albert, Prince of Carignano, had succeeded to the crown on the death of Charles Felix in April 1831. The situation of this prince between Austria, which he feared, and the liberals, whom he had betrayed, was somewhat critical; but on the whole he inclined to the liberal side, where his interests seemed to lie.

After his flight from Italy, Prince Louis Napoleon had for the most part lived with his mother, Queen Hortense, at her château of Arenaberg in the Thurgau. While residing in Switzerland he employed himself in studying the science of artillery in the school at Thun, under the tuition of Dufours. At this period his character seemed to be earnest and thoughtful, though he was not averse to the pleasures of youth. He aspired to a literary reputation, and composed at this time "Political Dreams," "Remarks on the Political and Military Condition of Switzerland," and a "Handbook of the Science of Artillery." The unpopularity which Louis Philippe had incurred suggested to him an attempt on the crown of France. Hence the abortive conspiracy of Strasburg in 1836; the best excuse for which is, that he merely wished to attract the notice of the world, and to exhibit himself as a leader to those who desired the downfall of Louis Philippe. After some preparations at Strasburg, through Colonel Vaudray and others, he caused himself, on the morning of October 30th, to be proclaimed Emperor, when he was joined by a small portion of the troops. The greater part, however, remained faithful to the King; and the Prince and his fellow conspirators were arrested and conducted to Paris. Louis Philippe was surprised and embarrassed by this strange event; but he immediately dismissed the Prince,

thinking that the ridicule which attached to so rash and inconsiderate an enterprise sufficed to render him harmless. Louis Napoleon now proceeded to America; but, alarmed at the illness of his mother, returned to Switzerland the following year by way of England. His Strasburg accomplices were acquitted at the assizes in January 1837, an event which strengthened the opposition by manifesting the disposition of the people. After the death of Queen Hortense, October 5th, Louis Philippe called upon the Swiss to expel the Prince from their territories, who, however, demurred to comply, as Louis Napoleon had been made an honorary citizen of the Thurgau. But he voluntarily relinquished a privilege which might tell against his claims to the French crown, declared that he was, and would remain, a Frenchman, and in the autumn of 1838 he took up his residence in London.

The discovery of Louis Philippe's insatiable avarice increased his unpopularity. To his inheritance, the richest in France, he had added all the possessions of Charles X. and Condé; he had entered into partnership with the Rothschilds, thus becoming a commercial, as well as a citizen king; and not content with all his wealth, he solicited marriage portions for his children, and even tried to augment them by false representations. Thus on the marriage of the Duke of Nemours to the Princess Victoria of Coburg early in 1837, Louis Philippe destined for him a million francs besides the domain of Rambouillet; but the Chamber demurred, and it turned out on inquiry that Rambouillet had been valued much too low. Marriage settlements were also procured for the Duke of Orleans, who espoused a Mecklenburg princess May 30th, and for the Queen of the Belgians. Towards the end of 1837, Louis Philippe obtained a little military glory by the conquest of Constantine, taken by storm by General Damremont October 13th. In the winter, a naval expedition was despatched to Hayti, which compelled the negro government of that island to pay a compensation of sixty million francs to the expelled planters.

Towards the end of 1838 the leaders of three of the four parties into which the Chamber was divided, namely, Thiers, Guizot and Odillon Barrot, the respective heads of the *centre gauche*, the *centre droit*, and the *côté gauche*, having formed a coalition, the Molé ministry was overthrown early in the following year by an adverse address moved and carried by M. Thiers. Louis Philippe now wished Marshal Soult to conduct the Government; but as M. Thiers, whose services the Marshal considered indispensable, appeared to set too much value on them, the arrangements went off, and the Duke of Montebello, son of Marshal Lannes, became

prime minister. But his hold of power was short. The republicans of the secret society called *la société des familles*, led by Blanqui and Barbès, succeeded, May 12th, in seizing the Hôtel de Ville, throwing up barricades, &c. They were soon put down; but their attempt induced Soult, ever ready to throw his sword into the scale of danger, to accept the office of prime minister. Early in 1840, however, the Government was again overthrown by M. Thiers on the question of the marriage-settlement of the Duke of Nemours, and Louis Philippe found himself compelled to place that intriguer at the head of the ministry. M. Guizot was now appointed ambassador at the Court of St. James's. But the Eastern question, which nearly involved France and England in a war, soon proved fatal to the ministry of Thiers.

Mehemet Ali, not content with the Isle of Candia in reward of his services to the Sultan in Greece, had thrown a covetous eye on Syria. The Porte seemed in no condition to defend that province, and in the autumn of 1831, Mehemet, under pretence of punishing the Pasha of St. Jean d'Acre for some affronts, despatched thither his son Ibrahim, with an army. Acre did not fall till May 27th 1832. But Ibrahim had betrayed his real design by occupying a great part of the country. After the capture of Acre he proceeded to take Damascus and Tripoli; and having defeated Hussein Pasha July 7th, whom the Sultan had despatched against him with a large army, he entered Aleppo and Antioch. The Grand Vizier, Redschid Pasha, who attempted to oppose his progress, was defeated and captured at Konieh, Dec. 21st.

The Sultan Mahmoud, trembling for Constantinople itself, now implored the aid of Russia, as well as of England and France. Nicholas having despatched a fleet to Constantinople, the French also sent one, but only to watch that of Russia. Ibrahim continuing to advance, and Mehemet Ali having refused French mediation, the Sultan had no alternative but to throw himself upon the protection of Russia. In April 1833, Nicholas sent 5000 men to Scutari, while another Russian army of 30,000 crossed the Pruth. But an English fleet having appeared and joined the French, the Russians withdrew, and Mehemet submitted to mediation, by which Syria was assigned to him, to be held as a fief of the Porte. Mahmoud, indignant at being thus treated by the Western Powers, threw himself into the arms of Russia, and by the Treaty of Hunkiar Skelessi, July 8th 1833, agreed not to suffer any but Russian ships to pass the Dardanelles. But on

the protest of England and France, the treaty was subsequently modified in favour of those countries in January 1834.

The Porte, encouraged by England and Russia, attempted in 1839 to recover Syria; but Ibrahim totally defeated the Turkish army at Nisib on the Euphrates, June 24th. Sultan Mahmoud, who had experienced little but misfortune during his reign, expired a few days after (June 28th); leaving his empire to his son, Abdul Medschid, then only seventeen years of age, yet already enervated by premature enjoyment. The French now wished the Osmanli sceptre to be transferred to Mehemet Ali, as better qualified than Abdul for the difficult task of maintaining the integrity of the Turkish Empire; but this proposition was opposed by England as well as Russia. So strong was the opinion of the approaching fall of the House of Osman, that the Capudan Pasha, Achmet Fewzi, carried the Turkish fleet to Alexandria, and placed it at the disposal of Mehemet. The English Ministry now proposed to France to prevent any further extension of Mehemet's power, and to aid the Porte, though not in such a manner as to forward the views of Russia. The French, however, took up the cause of Mehemet, and were for establishing him in the independent possession both of Egypt and Syria. Some warm diplomatic correspondence ensued; till at length England persuaded Russia, Austria, and Prussia to join her in the Treaty of London, July 15th 1840, by which both Syria and Candia were to be restored to the Porte. A small English and Austrian army was landed in Syria, and being joined by some Turks and Druses, defeated the hitherto victorious army of Ibrahim at Kaleb Medina, Oct. 10th. Acre, attacked from the sea, surrendered Nov. 4th, and Mehemet, seeing the impossibility of successful resistance, agreed to the provisions of the London treaty Nov. 27th, and restored Candia and Syria, as well as the Turkish fleet, to the Porte. The young Sultan was after this mostly guided by the counsels of England, ably conducted by Sir Stratford Canning, afterwards Lord Redcliffe, her ambassador at Constantinople.

This affair created great indignation in France, and rendered the Thiers ministry highly unpopular. A rupture with England seemed for some time imminent; but Louis Philippe, as usual, only employed the conjuncture to promote his domestic interests, and under the alarm of a European war, carried the project for the fortification of Paris by a girdle of forts; designed rather to keep down the populace within than to repel an enemy from without. Louis Napoleon had also seized the occasion to make another attempt on the crown. Landing at Boulogne, August 4th, with a

few followers, of whom Count Montholon was the most distinguished, he proclaimed himself Emperor of the French, and named M. Thiers as his minister. Being repulsed by the troops, he was nearly drowned in his attempt to escape by the upsetting of a boat, but was saved and captured. M. Berryer undertook his defence before the Chamber of Peers; but he was condemned, and sentenced to imprisonment at Ham; where he passed six years, for the most part spent in study and writing.

Another attempt on the King's life by an assassin named Darmès, October 17th, is said to have occasioned the dismissal of M. Thiers on the 29th. That minister had become so unpopular, and the state of French affairs was so discouraging, that a change of ministry was absolutely necessary. Marshal Soult now again became the nominal prime minister, but M. Guizot, to whom was intrusted the portfolio for foreign affairs, exercised supreme influence in the cabinet. The transfer of the remains of Napoleon from St. Helena to Paris by the consent of England, served to heal the temporary breach of the *entente cordiale* between England and France. The body arrived at Paris December 15th 1840, and was entombed with great solemnity at the *Invalides*. But so vivid a resuscitation of Napoleon's memory was not perhaps the discreetest act on the part of Louis Philippe.

M. Humann, the minister of finance, having in 1841 caused a new census of the people to be taken, in order to include persons who had hitherto escaped taxation, disturbances broke out in several parts of France, and even in Paris; but the rioters were reduced to order, and M. Guizot proceeded against them with severity. The death of Louis Philippe's eldest son, the Duke of Orleans, killed by a fall from his carriage June 13th 1842, was a severe blow to the new dynasty. The Duke indeed left two sons, Louis Philippe, Count de Paris, and Robert, Duke de Chartres; but the eldest was only in his fourth year, and thus the prospect was opened of a long minority. The main spring of Louis Philippe's policy was the maintenance of peace, and especially the preservation of the *entente cordiale* with England; a policy, however, which he sometimes pushed to a length that irritated the national feelings of the French, and rendered him unpopular. An instance of this sort occurred in the affair of Mr. Pritchard, an English missionary at Tahiti. Mr. Pritchard having been improperly arrested in 1843 by the French captain D'Aubigny, the English Government made peremptory demands for satisfaction, which were granted by the Cabinet of the Tuileries. In so doing they only obeyed the dictates of justice and good sense; but they

offended the national vanity of the French and rendered M. Guizot's administration unpopular. In pursuance of the same policy, Louis Philippe in the following year paid a visit to Queen Victoria in England, when he was invested with the Order of the Garter. By these means the reign of Louis Philippe was passed in profound peace with regard to Europe; though the military ardour of the French was at the same time gratified by battles and conquests in Africa. The French succeeded in establishing themselves at Algiers, where, under the auspices of General Bugeaud, a dreadful system of *razzias* was inaugurated, and every sort of cruelty perpetrated on both sides. As Abd-el Kader, the celebrated leader of the Arabs, supported himself against the French by the aid of the Maroquins, an expedition was undertaken against the Emperor of Morocco, who by the overthrow of his army at the battle of the Isly, August 14th 1844, was compelled to sue for peace. For this exploit Bugeaud was rewarded with the marshal's bâton. About the same time the Prince de Joinville with the French fleet attacked the town of Mogador, and compelled it to surrender.

The slyness of Louis Philippe sometimes outran his caution. In spite of all his care, the affair of the Spanish marriages in 1846 nearly led to a rupture with Great Britain. But before we relate that transaction it will be necessary to take a brief retrospect of Spanish history.

After losing his first Sicilian wife, Ferdinand VII. had married a Portuguese princess, and on her death in 1818, a princess of the House of Saxony, who also died in 1829. By none of these three consorts had he had any issue. At the age of forty-six, and debilitated in constitution, he married for his fourth wife Maria Christina, daughter of Ferdinand IV. of Naples, and sister of the Duchess of Berri, and of Maria Carlotta, married to the Spanish King's youngest brother Francisco. Three months after this marriage, the new Queen appearing to be pregnant, Ferdinand published a *Pragmatic Sanction* abolishing the Salic law, March 29th 1830. Ferdinand's brothers Carlos and Francisco, as well as Charles X. of France and Francis I. of the Two Sicilies, brother of the Spanish Queen, protested against this act, which threatened their collateral claims to the throne of Spain. But Ferdinand persisted, and on the 10th of October 1830, his Queen was delivered of a daughter, Isabella, who was recognised as Princess of the Asturias, or heiress apparent of the throne. Ferdinand having been seized with a severe illness in the autumn of 1832, Don Carlos either extorted

from him a revocation of the Pragmatic Sanction, or caused one to be forged. But Maria Christina, who had borne another daughter in the preceding January, declared herself Regent for her daughter Isabella during the King's illness, and sought popularity by some liberal measures. She granted an amnesty to the insurgents who, as already related, had risen after the French Revolution of July; she re-established the universities, which had been dissolved after the Restoration; and by the advice of Martinez de la Rosa, she announced a speedy re-assembly of the Cortès. Ferdinand unexpectedly recovered, and resumed the reins of government in January 1833, when he confirmed all that the Queen had done; and Don Carlos, after protesting, withdrew to Don Miguel in Portugal. In pursuance of the more liberal policy inaugurated by Christina, Ferdinand again appointed Zea Bermudez to the ministry, and agreeably to the Queen's promise, reopened the Cortès, July 29th, when that assembly did homage to his daughter Isabella as their future sovereign. Ferdinand VII. did not long survive this event. He was again attacked by his disorder, and expired in dreadful torments, Sept. 29th 1833.

Isabella II. was now proclaimed Queen, and her mother Christina assumed the Regency. The Pragmatic Sanction was recognised by Louis Philippe and by the English Government; but the Northern Powers, as well as the Pope, refused to acknowledge it. Spain itself was divided in opinion and torn by factions. The Liberals and moderate party supported the Queen, and were hence called *Christinos*, while the Serviles declared for Don Carlos, and obtained the name of *Carlists*. The *Christinos*, though not at one among themselves, prevailed. In 1834, Zea Bermudez was compelled to resign in favour of the still more liberal Martinez de la Rosa. On the 10th of April the new minister proclaimed the *Estatuto Real*, a constitution modelled by the advice of Louis Philippe. But it was not sufficiently liberal to please the extreme party; warm disputes arose between the *Moderados* and *Progresistas*, and Martinez de la Rosa, to whose embarrassments was added that of a civil war, was unable to maintain himself.

The *Carlists* had raised an insurrection in Biscay in 1833. Their strength lay chiefly in the Basque provinces, which had been injured by the system of centralisation adopted by Ferdinand after the French model. The insurrection also spread to other provinces, but not to any great extent. The priest Merino in Old Castile, and Locho in La Mancha, raised some *guerilla* bands. The Basque army, which had gradually increased to 25,000 men, found an excellent leader in Zumalacarragui. Generals Sarsfeld,

Valdez, and two or three more in vain attempted to subdue it. Don Carlos, who had been driven from Portugal and taken refuge in England, returned secretly through France, and appearing in Zumalacarragui's camp, June 9th 1834, was received with acclamation. But he was totally unfit for the enterprise he had undertaken. He surrounded himself with the stiffest etiquette, and he continued to maintain the Apostolic Junta, a former member of which, Father Cirilo, was his most intimate confidant. Spain, like other parts of Europe, was this year visited by the *cholera*, when a hundred monks, suspected of having poisoned the fountains, were murdered in Madrid alone, and many others in various towns. This popular prejudice was manifested in other countries with the same results.

In 1835, Mina undertook the command of the *Christinos*, but, like his predecessors, was worsted by Zumalacarragui after a sanguinary campaign of five months. Valdez, who resumed the attempt with 20,000 men, had no better success. These unfortunate campaigns exhausted the troops and money of the Spanish Government, and compelled the Regent to apply to the Western Powers for aid. Louis Philippe pursued in the affairs of Spain his usual double and self-interested policy. He had formed the design of marrying his sons to Christina's daughters, and he courted the friendship of the Spanish Regent and pressed upon her his advice, yet without taking so decided a part in her affairs as might excite the hostility of the Northern Powers. In like manner he went hand in hand with England in opposing *Carlism*, but so as not to give too much strength to the *Progresistas*. It was not till the summer of 1835, after the unlooked-for resistance of the Basques, that Louis Philippe prepared to give Christina any active assistance, agreeably to the Quadruple Alliance formed in the preceding year. But as that alliance had reference primarily to the affairs of Portugal, we must here briefly resume the history of that country.

After the banishment of Don Miguel before recorded, Portugal remained tranquil till the death of the weak but well-meaning King John VI., March 10th 1826. As Don Pedro, his eldest son, now Emperor of Brazil, was precluded by the constitution of that country from assuming the crown of Portugal, he transferred it to his youthful daughter, Donna Maria da Gloria, while Don Miguel, John's second son, asserted his claim as the only legitimate male heir. The question of the succession, therefore, was somewhat analogous to that which subsequently arose in Spain, turning on the claims of a direct female and collateral male heir. Both pretenders

to the crown were absent, and public opinion in Portugal was very much divided. The Liberals, led by Count Villaflor, and composed for the most part of the educated and commercial classes and a portion of the army, were for Donna Maria, while the Serviles, as they were called, with the Marquis de Chaves at their head, comprising the clergy, the peasantry, and the remainder of the troops, espoused the cause of Don Miguel. The adverse parties had already come to blows, when the landing of 6000 English soldiers in the Tagus in December, despatched by Canning, decided the question in favour of Donna Maria. The Serviles now submitted, Queen Maria was acknowledged, and Donna Isabella, the young Queen's aunt, was placed at the head of the Regency. The Cortès being assembled, January 2nd 1828, accepted the charter of a constitution drawn up by Don Pedro on liberal principles.

These proceedings were highly displeasing to the Northern Powers, who, as the assertors of legitimacy and of the principles of the Holy Alliance, espoused the cause of Don Miguel. Under these circumstances a compromise was adopted. Don Miguel, as before suggested by Don Pedro, was betrothed to his niece, and it was arranged that he should undertake the Regency in her name. He accordingly returned to Lisbon, after paying a visit to England on his way, and took the oath to the Constitution, February 26th. But on the 13th of March, immediately after the departure of the English army, he dissolved the Chambers and annulled Don Pedro's Constitution; and as the clergy and the great mass of the people were in favour of the ancient absolutism, an attempt at insurrection in support of the Charter proved abortive.

Encouraged by this success, Miguel proceeded to further violence. On the 17th of June, declaring the succession established by his brother to be invalid, he seized the throne for himself, as legitimate King, and his usurpation was sanctioned by acclamation by the assembled Cortès on the 26th. Miguel now displayed all the vices and caprices of his character. The leading liberals who had not succeeded in escaping were thrown into prison; some of them were executed, the rest were treated with the greatest cruelty. The young tyrant sometimes assaulted his sister Isabella to the danger of her life; and he displayed his levity and caprice by making a *ci-devant* barber, one of his favourites, Duke of Queluz. He succeeded, however, in maintaining himself upon the throne, and two conspiracies in 1829 were suppressed and punished by bloody and illegal executions. Don Pedro despatched a fleet to Terceira, and made some unsuccessful attempts in favour

of his daughter. Donna Maria had retired to Brazil, where, in 1830, she was betrothed to the young prince Augustus von Leuchtenberg, whose sister Don Pedro had married. In 1831, Don Pedro being compelled by a revolution to relinquish the throne of Brazil to his youthful son, Don Pedro II., took charge of his daughter's affairs in person, and sailed for Terceira with a well-appointed army and fleet. He landed at Oporto July 8th 1832, and was received with enthusiasm; but Miguel kept him shut up a whole year in that town. Napier, however, the commander of Pedro's fleet, having almost annihilated that of Miguel in a battle off Cape St. Vincent, July 5th 1833, it became possible to ship an army at Oporto for Lisbon. Miguel's forces having been defeated in a bloody battle, he was compelled to fly, and Pedro entered Lisbon July 28th. Two months after, Donna Maria arrived from London, and assumed the crown Sept. 23rd. Marshal Bourmont, driven from France by the Revolution, having obtained the command of the Miguelite forces, made an attempt upon Lisbon, which was defeated October 10th; but Miguel still maintained himself in the provinces.

In this state of things the Northern Powers, the patrons of legitimacy even in such representatives of the principle as Carlos and Miguel, having assumed at a congress at München Grätz a hostile, or at all events adverse, attitude to the policy of France and England, the latter Powers concluded with the Queens of Spain and Portugal a quadruple alliance, April 22nd 1834. Miguel, alarmed by this step, agreed by the Treaty of Evoramonte to quit the Peninsula May 26th, and he subsequently fixed his residence at Rome. On the 24th of the following September Don Pedro expired. The marriage of Queen Maria with the Prince of Leuchtenberg was celebrated in January 1835; but in the following March the youthful bridegroom was carried off by a cold, and Queen Maria, on the proposal of England, shortly after accepted the hand of Prince Ferdinand of Coburg. We now return to the affairs of Spain.

The Spanish Queen did not derive much benefit from the Quadruple Alliance. By a treaty of June 28th 1835, Louis Philippe indeed allowed the *Christinos* the aid of the so-called foreign legion, composed of all the scum of Paris; which had been sent to Algiers, and served as food for powder in the fights with the Arabs and Kabyles. A legion of much the same kind, under General Evans, was also organised in England. But before these troops could arrive the position of Christina had become very critical. Although the Carlists had lost their great general

Zumalacarragui, killed at the siege of Bilbao June 25th, yet his place was ably filled by the brave and youthful Cabrera. The Spanish Government, besides having to contend with the Carlists, was also menaced by the factions and discontent of its own supporters. The Regent, indeed, in her heart detested the *Progresistas*, and it was only with reluctance that she was driven, through the success of the Carlists, to court their aid. That party established in 1835 a Junta at Barcelona, and demanded that the Constitution of 1812 should be restored; nor could Mina, whom the Queen had appointed governor of that place, succeed in restoring obedience to the Government. The example spread: Juntas were erected at Saragossa, Valencia, Seville, Malaga, Cadiz, and other places; till at last the revolt broke out in the capital itself. The Regent was compelled to proclaim the Constitution of 1812 at her castle at La Granja, August 13th 1836, and to place Calatrava, a liberal, at the head of the ministry.

On that very day General Lebeau, at the head of the French foreign legion, had at length entered Spain, and published a manifesto, proclaiming that he had been sent by the King of the French to support the Queen. But no sooner did Louis Philippe hear of the proclamation of La Granja, than he publicly disavowed his general in the *Moniteur*. He well knew that a government founded on the Spanish Constitution of 1812, instead of following his counsels, would make common cause with the republican party in France. Agreeably, however, to the Quadruple Alliance, he suffered his legion to remain in Spain, where it continued to fight in the *Christina* cause till it was almost exhausted. Meanwhile Don Carlos not only prospered in the North, but also gained adherents in Andalusia and the South. In the spring of 1837 he even felt himself strong enough to make an attempt on Madrid, and gained a victory at Villa de las Navarras; but on the appearance of Espartero, who had relinquished the siege of Bilbao, he lost heart and retired, and from this time his cause declined. Among the fanatical decrees which he issued in Biscay, was one directing that all Englishmen should be put to death, because they prevented him from receiving assistance by sea!

The Cortès on the model of 1812 were opened by Christina June 18th 1837, when she took an oath to the Constitution. She nevertheless favoured a reactionary policy, and was supported in it by the victorious Espartero, who belonged to the *Moderados*. That party was also favoured by Louis Philippe, who wished to suppress the insurrection in Spain, and to form a matrimonial connection for his sons with the Spanish family; while England

opposed this policy by supporting the *Progresistas*. In the autumn of 1838, Narvaez having failed in an attempt to overthrow Espartero, was compelled to fly to England. Maroto, who soon afterwards obtained the command of the Basque army, seeing the incapacity of Don Carlos, resolved to abandon the cause of legitimacy, and concluded a treaty with Espartero at Bergara, August 31st 1839, by which the Basque provinces agreed to acknowledge Queen Isabella II. on condition of recovering their *Fueros*, or ancient customs. Carlos now fled over the Pyrenees; when Louis Philippe caused him to be apprehended and kept him in honourable custody at Bourges. General O'Donnel dispersed the remains of the Carlists in the summer of 1840.

Espartero was rewarded for his success with the title of "Duke of Victory." Christina tried to persuade him to annul the Basque *Fueros*; but he would not consent, and he was supported in his policy by an insurrection at Barcelona. Christina now fled to Valencia, and placed herself under the protection of O'Donnel; but in her absence, the people of Madrid rose and proclaimed a provisional government, an example which was followed by most of the principal towns of Spain; and the Regent found herself compelled to appoint Espartero prime minister. Espartero made a sort of triumphal entry into Madrid, Sept. 16th, and in the following October, Christina laid down the Regency in his favour and quitted Spain. This step was not taken entirely on political grounds. A secret marriage with Muñoz, a private in the guards, by whom she had several children, as well as an accusation of embezzling the public money, had rendered her contemptible. She proceeded to Rome, and thence to France, where she took up her abode till, as the instrument of Louis Philippe, she might find an opportunity again to interfere in the affairs of Spain.

The Regency of Espartero, who was a moderate *Progresista*, attracted the envy and opposition of the other generals. Hence what were called the *Pronunciamentos*. Wherever the people were dissatisfied with the proceedings of the Government or the person of the Regent, they *pronounced* against them and threatened to throw Spain into eternal confusion. To this, however, an end was put by the Cortès confirming Espartero in the Regency, May 8th 1841; though Arguelles was named guardian of Isabella. Espartero maintained himself in the Regency, in spite of much opposition and many insurrections, till July 1843, when being defeated by Narvaez in Valencia, he was compelled to fly to England. The policy of Spain at this period turned much on the marriage of the young Queen. The *Moderados* wanted to marry

her, or at all events her sister, to a French prince; the moderate *Progresistas* approved the English proposal of a German prince; while the *ultras* of the latter party wished her to espouse her cousin, the son of Louisa Charlotte. That princess had formed a project to keep her sister Maria Christina for ever out of Spain, and to seize upon the Government. But her plans were cut short by a sudden death, January 29th 1844.

The young Queen Isabella II. had been declared of age by the Cortès, November 10th 1843, when she took the oath to the Constitution. Narvaez, who now enjoyed the supreme military power, being a *Moderado* and consequently favouring the views of France and Christina, the Queen-mother ventured, after her sister's death, to return to Madrid. She obtained the guidance of her daughter, but intent only on the gratification of her base inclinations, suffered Narvaez to rule. She created Muñoz Duke of Rianzarez and a grandee of Spain, and employed herself in accumulating large sums for her numerous children by him. Meanwhile Narvaez pursued a reactionary policy by curtailing the power of the Cortès, restoring the prerogatives of the Crown, recalling the exiled bishops, and otherwise promoting the interests of the Church. In 1845, in company with Christina and her two daughters, he made a tour in the provinces; when they were met at Pampeluna by Louis Philippe's sons, the Dukes of Nemours and Aumale, with a view to forward the projected marriages. Narvaez was now created Duke of Valencia. But he was suddenly dismissed, April 4th 1846, for having, it is suspected, favoured the suit of Francis, Count of Trapani, son of the King of Naples, for the hand of Isabella. Isturitz, who had before held the reins of power, now became prime minister.

Other suitors to the young Queen were her cousins, Don Henry, second son of the Infant Francis de Paula; and Charles Louis, Count of Montemolin, son of Don Carlos, who had made over to his son all his claims to the Spanish throne. An insurrection was even attempted in favour of Don Henry; but its leader, Colonel Solis, was shot, and Don Henry banished from Spain. A marriage with the Count of Montemolin would have united all the claims to the Spanish throne; but both France and England opposed it. Louis Philippe, with the acquiescence of Christina, had selected for Isabella's husband, Francis de Assis, the eldest son of Francis de Paula, a young man alike incapable in mind and body; while he destined his own son, the Duke de Montpensier, for Isabella's younger and healthier sister, Maria Louisa. Louis Philippe had promised Queen Victoria, when on a visit to him at the Château

d'Eu in Normandy in 1845, that the marriage of his son with the Infanta should not take place till Isabella had given birth to an heir to the throne. The young Queen had manifested her aversion for Francis de Assis, and in reliance on the English scheme, Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg had proceeded to Madrid in the spring of 1846 to sue for her hand. But by the machinations of Louis Philippe and Christina, Isabella's scruples to accept her cousin were overcome, and the King of the French, sacrificing without remorse the domestic happiness of the young Queen, gained a transient and not very honourable triumph by the *fait accompli* of a simultaneous marriage of Isabella with Francis de Assis, and of Montpensier with Maria Louisa, October 10th 1846. Louis Philippe's deep-laid plot was, however, ultimately frustrated by unforeseen circumstances. The expulsion of the Orleans dynasty from France at once severed the family connection between the two crowns; and even had Louis Philippe remained in possession of the French throne, the hopes of the Duke of Montpensier would still have been frustrated by Queen Isabella giving birth to a daughter in 1851. That this child, however, was the offspring of Francis de Assis is more than doubtful. Francis was kept at a country residence, while Isabella surrounded herself with those who pleased her. General Serrano, one of the handsomest men in Spain, is said to have had an especial claim to that honour. By his advice, Isabella emancipated herself from her mother's guidance, and favoured the party of the *Progresistas*, while Christina proceeded again to Paris to seek the advice of Louis Philippe. Isabella banished all the ancient Spanish etiquette, and the Court became a scene of scandalous dissipation.

While Louis Philippe was thus engaged in the affairs of Spain, his own fall was preparing in France. The discontent which extensively prevailed in that kingdom was increased by the scarcity in the years 1846 and 1847. Disturbances broke out in several places, and the liberal party began to agitate an electoral reform. The Central Electoral Committee at Paris declared itself *en permanence*, and incited the provincial committees to petition the Government. At a grand reform banquet, held at Chateaurouge near Paris, July 9th 1847, at which 1200 persons were present, the King's health was omitted, but the toast of "the sovereignty of the people" was drunk with acclamation. A similar banquet took place at Mans, August 10th, under the presidency of Ledru Rollin, and was followed by many others in various places. The reactionary policy of M. Guizot, and his determination to maintain the English alliance, were highly unpopular; while the corruption

of some members of the Administration and of the Chambers had rendered the Government in general contemptible. The French republicans were encouraged by the triumph of the radicals in Switzerland, and by the progress of Mazzini's doctrines in Italy. *Communism*, an offshoot of *St. Simonism*, had spread very extensively among the lower classes of the French, while M. Louis Blanc had brought forward a gigantic scheme of Utopian *Socialism*, by which the State was to form one large happy family, providing work and maintenance for all its members. The elements of disturbance and revolution were insidiously stirred by M. Thiers, with the design of supplanting Guizot, and again seizing the reins of government.

The King, on opening the Chambers Dec. 27th 1847, indiscreetly alluded in offensive terms to the reform banquet, and intimated his conviction that no reform was needed. In consequence of this, very sharp debates took place, on the Address, which lasted till the middle of February. The Electoral Committee of Paris, in conjunction with a committee of the opposition deputies, and of the officers of the National Guard, determined to have a colossal reform banquet in the Champs Elysées on the 22nd February 1848, when it was expected that 100,000 spectators would be present. But it was forbidden by M. Guizot, who threatened to prevent it, if necessary, by military force. Odillon Barrot and most of the deputies now abandoned any further opposition, though M. Lamartine and a few followers continued to declaim against the arbitrariness of the Government. The fête did not take place, as Marshal Bugeaud, who had between 50,000 and 60,000 men in Paris and its neighbourhood, was prepared to suppress it, while the guns of the forts were directed upon Paris. But symptoms of revolt began to manifest themselves among the Parisian populace; barricades were thrown up, and some conflicts took place with the municipal guard. The riots were renewed on the 23rd, and the National Guard, which was called out for the protection of the city, manifested a hostile disposition towards the government by shouts of *Vive la Réforme*! *A bas Guizot*! The King was weak enough to yield to this demonstration, by dismissing Guizot, and sending for Count Molé to form a new Administration. The tumult continued in the ensuing night, but without any very marked character, till a Lyonese named Lagrange, a determined republican and influential leader amongst the secret societies, gave matters a decided turn by conducting a large band, carrying a red flag, to the hotel of M. Guizot, where a battalion of infantry had been drawn up for his protection. A shot, fired, it

is said, by Lagrange himself, having killed their commanding officer, the troops answered by a volley, which prostrated many dead and wounded on the pavement. The corpse of a woman was now placed in a cart and paraded through the streets by torch-light; every now and then the cart stopped, and the body, bleeding at the breast, was exposed to the gaze of the infuriated populace.

While these scenes were passing out of doors, all was indecision in the palace. Count Molé declined to accept the ministry, and recourse was then had to M. Thiers. But matters had gone rather further than that statesman had contemplated, and he required that M. Odillon Barrot should be joined with him. Thiers now required of the King to consent to the reforms demanded, to summon a new Chamber, elected on those principles, to forbid the troops to use any further violence towards the people, and to dismiss Marshal Bugeaud; in short, to disarm, without bringing into action his enormous military preparations. But Louis Philippe had completely lost his head. He agreed to all the demands of Thiers, who immediately issued a proclamation stating that reform had been granted, that all motive for further opposition was removed, and that the soldiery had orders not to fire. But the proclamation came too late; nay, as the signature had been omitted, it only excited the suspicions of the people, as intended to disarm them. Bugeaud was dismissed on the morning of February 24th, having previously signed an order forbidding the troops to fire. Many of the soldiers now began to fraternise with the people; fresh barricades were erected, and the attack drew hourly nearer and nearer to the Tuileries. The Palais Royal was stormed, and its costly furniture destroyed; while the troops, agreeably to their orders, looked quietly on; the municipal guards were massacred without assistance. The Duke of Nemours, who had been appointed Regent in case of his father's abdication, rejected Bugeaud's pressing instances to resort to force. Louis Philippe would not listen to his consort's exhortations to put himself at the head of the troops. As the storm approached the Tuileries, indeed, he mounted his horse and rode towards the troops; but he uttered not a word. The soldiery also remained dumb; but some of the National Guards cried *Vive la Réforme*! *À bas les ministres*! The King turned back, and all was lost. It was a repetition of Louis XVI.'s review of August 10th.

M. Giradin now pressed into the King's presence, and exclaimed, "Sire, you must abdicate!" Louis Philippe, at the instance of the Duke de Montpensier, at length signed an Act of Abdication in favour of the Count de Paris, his grandson, and then hurried to

St. Cloud. General Lamoricière carried out the Act of Abdication, and exhibited it to the people; but Lagrange tore the sheet from his hand, exclaiming, "It is not enough—the whole dynasty must go!" As Lamoricière turned to depart, his horse was shot and he himself wounded. His soldiers lifted him up and fired. This incident aided the republican cause. A little more blood gave it a stimulus. The royal family were in consternation and at a loss how to act. Thiers had vanished nobody knew whither, and left them to take care of themselves. The Duke de Nemours, as Regent, conducted the Duchess of Orleans, with her two young sons, to the Chamber of Deputies; but the mob broke in and prevented the proclamation of the Regency. In the midst of the tumult, Marie, an advocate, mounted the tribune and proposed a Provisional Government. The motion was received with shouts of applause. Dunoyer, at the head of another band, carrying a flag captured at the Tuileries, now forced his way into the Chamber, and exclaimed: "This flag proclaims our victory; outside are 100,000 combatants, who will have neither King nor Regency." It was but too plain that all was lost, and the royal family made their escape from Paris.

A Provisional Government was now appointed, consisting of Dupont de l'Eure, Lamartine the poet, Arago the astronomer, Marie, Garnier Pagès, Ledru Rollin, and Crémieux. These names were received with acclamation by the members, and by the armed mob which filled the precincts of the Chamber. On the motion of Lamartine, the new Government resolved to fix itself at the Hôtel de Ville, in order to prevent the establishment there of a Republican Socialist Directory. Louis Blanc, Marrast, Bastide, Floçon, and other leaders of the Republicans and Socialists, had indeed already taken possession of that building, and would no doubt have opposed the Provisional Government, had not the latter deemed it expedient to coalesce with them. It is to the firmness of Lamartine that must be attributed the preservation of any degree of order among these discordant elements. He allowed the Republic to be proclaimed only on condition of its future approval by the people, to whose newly-elected representatives was to be intrusted the settlement of the Constitution. Lamartine also caused a guard of young people to be formed for the protection of the Government, and thus eliminated one of the most dangerous elements of the revolt.

Matters, however, still wore a threatening aspect. The mob had broken into the Tuileries, demolished all the furniture, and taken up their abode in the palace. The throne, after being

carried in triumphal procession through the streets, was burnt in a bonfire. Lagrange, armed with a huge sabre, at the head of the most furious of the populace, endeavoured to drive Lamartine from the Hôtel de Ville, by threats, and by the stench of dead bodies piled up in the lower rooms and on the staircases. Lamartine resisted with admirable courage these attempts at intimidation, and calmed the minds of the people by his exhortations. The middle classes, alarmed at the prospect of a red-republic, assembled, the National Guard appeared on the Place de Grève, and the mob with their red flag began gradually to disperse.

Louis Philippe, who was not pursued, fled towards the sea-coast, and after a concealment of nine days procured a passage for England in the name of Mr. William Smith. He was accompanied by the Queen and a few attendants, while the Duke de Montpensier, with the other ladies, except the Duchess of Orleans, who proceeded to Germany, took a different route to the coast, in order to lessen the risk of detection. Louis Philippe landed in England March 3rd, and took up his residence at Claremont, the property of his son-in-law the King of the Belgians.

Meanwhile the new French Government proceeded to consolidate itself. M. Louis Blanc was appointed "Minister of Progress," as a pledge for the furtherance of the "organisation of labour." The Luxembourg, abandoned by the Peers, received a new senate in a committee of labourers and mechanics, who there discussed their interests and demands. At their head was Albert, a workman in a *blouse*, who had obtained a place in the Government next to M. Louis Blanc. The scheme adopted was to open large national workshops, where all who applied might find employment and wages. Thus the State was converted into a master manufacturer, to whose service, as the pay was good and the superintendence not over strict, flocked all the lazy, skulking mechanics of Paris and its neighbourhood. They soon numbered 80,000, to be maintained at the public expense, for the ruin of private tradesmen. Thus the Revolution of 1848 was not like that of 1830, merely political, but social also, like the first Revolution; but on more absurd, though less inhuman principles, and such as could not fail speedily to work their own ruin.

The Provisional Government was recognised throughout France. Marshal Bugeaud acknowledged its authority, and was followed by the whole army. The Duke d'Aumale, who commanded in Algiers, surrendered his post to General Changarnier, and proceeded to England with his brother the Duke de Joinville, who had hitherto commanded the French fleet. The Provisional

Government superseded Changarnier by Cavaignac, the brother of an influential republican. The priests also submitted, for the Church was not threatened with persecution. After the interval of a fortnight, the prefect of police drove out the filthy crowd that had taken possession of the Tuileries, and that palace was converted into an hospital for old and infirm labourers. The same dangerous elements were, however, afloat as in the first Revolution, and if they did not gain the ascendancy it was because the higher and middle classes, instructed by experience, actively opposed them. The inscriptions of *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité* struck the eye on every side; the titles of *Monsieur* and *Madame* again gave place to those of *Citoyen* and *Citoyenne*; the Goddess of Liberty with her red cap appeared at every public festival, and trees of liberty were planted in all the public places. Low journals were published under the names of *La Guillotine, La Carmagnole,* &c., which adopted all the slang of *sans-culottisme,* and exhorted to plunder and murder in the style of Marat. The ultra-democrats Cabet, Blanqui, and Raspail formed a sort of triumvirate, and incited the Communist clubs to proceed to extremities. They attempted to put down Lamartine and the more moderate party, and to establish a Red Republic under Ledru Rollin. But the citizens and National Guards were on the alert. A mob having been collected, April 16th, to petition for an alteration in the relations between master and servant, 100,000 National Guards assembled to preserve the peace, and shouted *À bas Cabet! à bas le communisme!* From this day the extreme party was defeated.

The National Assembly met at Paris, May 4th. The majority of it were men of moderate opinions, some even desired a reaction; yet when Dupont de l'Eure, in the name of the Provisional Government, resigned its power into their hands, a Republic was voted by acclamation, and an Executive Commission was appointed to conduct the public business till the new Constitution should be established. The members of the Commission were Lamartine, Arago, Garnier Pagès, Marie and Ledru Rollin; and Louis Blanc, Albert, and the Socialists were excluded. A mob of Socialists and Communists broke into the Assembly, May 15th, and endeavoured to enforce a government in conformity with their views, but the attempt failed. This party was entirely overawed by the force displayed at a grand review held on May 21st; after which, Barbès, Albert, and Hubert were indicted and sentenced to transportation, and Blanqui to seven years' imprisonment. L. Blanc was also indicted, but escaped by flight.

When the news of the Revolution arrived in England, Louis

Napoleon, who had, in May 1846, succeeded in escaping to that country from his prison at Ham, immediately set off for Paris; but returned, in compliance with the wishes of the Provisional Government. On the 8th of June he was elected a representative for Paris, and he was also returned in the departments of Charente and Yonne. Two of his cousins, Napoleon, son of Jerôme, and Peter, son of Lucien, sat in the Assembly. These movements of the Bonaparte family excited the apprehension of Lamartine, who attempted to obtain with regard to Louis Napoleon the enforcement of the old decree for the banishment of the Emperor Napoleon's posterity. Louis Napoleon, thinking that his opportunity had not yet arrived, thanked the electors who had returned him, and declared himself ready to discharge any duties that the people might intrust to him, but for the present he remained in London.

An attempt of the Government to dismiss part of the workmen from the *ateliers nationaux* produced one of the bloodiest battles Paris had yet seen. These workmen, who now numbered near 100,000, and were regularly drilled, threw up barricades more artificially constructed than any that had yet been made, and defended them with desperation. The battle began on the 23rd of June, and lasted four days; but the insurgents were at length subdued by the superior force of the troops of the line and the National Guards. Many of the latter had come up from the provincial towns to aid in the suppression of Socialism. Some thousands of persons fell in this sanguinary affray, among them the venerable Monsieur Affre, Archbishop of Paris, while exhorting the rioters to peace. General Cavaignac, who had been appointed Dictator during the struggle, now laid down his office, but was appointed chief of the Executive Commission with the title of President of the Council.

The fear which Socialism had inspired had produced among the more educated classes a reaction in favour of monarchy. The national workshops were now suppressed, as well as all clubs and the revolutionary press. Even Lamartine and Cavaignac lost their popularity, and persons like Thiers began to appear, and to give a different direction to affairs. Cavaignac, however, who now directed the Government of France, had little personal ambition; he aimed at preserving peace both abroad and at home, and avoiding the extremes either of Socialism or despotism. Besides the Republicans and Socialists, three parties were in the field, the Legitimists, or adherents of Charles X.'s dynasty, the Orleanists and the Bonapartists. Louis Napoleon had remained quietly in London till he was again elected a representative for Paris, as well

as for four departments—the Moselle, Yonne, Lower Charente, and Corsica. He now returned to France, and after making a short speech in the Assembly, September 26th, took no further part in the debates. Meanwhile the new Constitution was prepared—a Republic, headed by a President elected every four years, but almost entirely dependent on the National Assembly. For the Presidency became candidates Louis Napoleon, Cavaignac, Lamartine, Ledru Rollin, and Raspail, the representative of the Socialists. In his address to the electors, Louis Napoleon promised order at home, peace abroad, a reduction of taxes, and a ministry chosen from the best and most able men of all parties. But the educated classes of Frenchmen entertained at this time a contempt for his abilities, and his pretensions were ridiculed by the newspapers. The peasantry and the common soldiers were his chief supporters. Thiers, however, and other intriguers of Louis Philippe's time, advocated his claims; but only in the expectation that he would display his incapacity, and serve as a stepping-stone to the restoration of the Orleans dynasty, while others supported him from envy and jealousy of Cavaignac. The election took place December 10th, when Napoleon obtained five-and-a-half million votes, while Cavaignac, who stood next, had only about one-and-a-half million, and the other candidates but very small numbers. Napoleon was installed in the office which he had thus triumphantly won, December 20th, and took up his residence in the Élisée. He appointed Odillon Barrot Minister of Justice, Drouyn de Lhuys to the Foreign Office, Malleville to the Home Office, General Rulhière to the War Department, De Tracy to the Navy, and Passy to the administration of the finances. To Marshal Bugeaud was intrusted the command of the army, and to Changarnier that of the National Guard; while Jerôme Bonaparte, ex-King of Westphalia, was made Governor of the *Invalides*.

The shock of the French Revolution of 1848, like that of the previous one, vibrated through Europe. The Germans were among the first to feel its influence. The affairs of Germany have claimed but a small part of our attention, for in fact there has been little to relate. While most of the nations of Europe were struggling for freedom or independence, the German mass remained inert. The subdivision of that people into a number of petty states, seems to damp the feeling of nationality and patriotism, which is also cowed and subdued by the immense standing armies of the two great military German despotisms, supported in the background by the Russian autocrat.

Before we describe the effects of the French Revolution in

Germany, we must briefly recapitulate a few events that had occurred there. The Imperial throne of Austria was now occupied by Ferdinand I. Francis, the last of the German and the first of the Austrian emperors, after an eventful reign which had commenced almost contemporaneously with the first French Republic, expired March 2nd 1835. His son and successor would have been still less fitted for such eventful times. Ferdinand was the personification of good nature, but weak both in body and mind, without all knowledge of business and led like a child by his minister, Prince Metternich. The death of the English King William IV. in 1837 had also vacated the crown of Hanover, and severed it from its connection with Great Britain. Victoria, our present gracious Sovereign, who ascended the throne of England on the death of her uncle, was disqualified by her sex, according to the laws of Hanover, from succeeding to that crown, which consequently devolved to her uncle Ernest Augustus, Duke of Cumberland. One of the first acts of the new King's reign was to abolish the Constitution which had been established in 1833, and to restore that of 1819. But this *coup d'état* was attended with no more serious result than the resignation of seven Göttingen professors. King Frederick William III. of Prussia had expired June 7th 1840. Of this king it may be said, that as few Sovereigns of modern times have experienced greater misfortunes and humiliations, so few or none more deserved them by the vacillation and timidity of his counsels, his want of all political principle, and his treachery towards his neighbours and allies. His son and successor Frederick William IV. began his reign with some liberal measures, which, however, soon appeared to be the effects of weakness rather than of wisdom and benevolence. Prussia had been promised a Representative Constitution in 1815, but nothing had yet been done. Frederick William IV. summoned to Berlin a sort of diet, or parliament, not, however, in the spirit of this promise, but merely composed of the provincial assemblies united together. The King opened this mock assembly April 11th with a fine sentimental speech, in which he observed that he would never allow a sheet of paper—that is, a Charter—to stand like a second Providence between him and the country! He complained of the spirit of innovation and infidelity that was abroad, and exclaimed, "I and my house will serve the Lord." The Chamber in their address claimed, but in vain, the promised Representative Constitution.

A trifling insurrection having occurred in Poland in 1846, Prussia and Russia agreed that the Republic of Cracow should be

incorporated with Austria; which accordingly took place in November, in spite of the opposition of Lord Palmerston, the English minister.

In Hungary, after the death of the Archduke Stephen, the Palatine, his son Joseph was elected to that high office. In 1847, the Emperor Ferdinand himself proceeded into Hungary, to be crowned with the holy crown of St. Stephen as King Ferdinand V. Instead of the usual Latin oration, he spoke on this occasion in the Hungarian tongue; a circumstance which increased the hopes of the Magyars of forcing, with their own language, their desires also of independence on the Slavonians, Germans, and Wallachians living in Hungary. Kossuth now distinguished himself as the most eloquent speaker and most influential member of the Opposition. The States of Bohemia also exerted themselves for the freedom of the press and the right of self-taxation; and even in Austria itself projects of reform were agitated.

It was about 1846 that complications began to arise concerning the Danish boundary. The old King, Frederick VI., had died in 1839. He was succeeded by his great nephew, Christian VIII., then fifty-four years of age, whose only son, Frederick, did not promise to leave any posterity. In the Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, females were excluded from succeeding to the Sovereignty, though, as we have seen, such was not the case in Denmark.[5] Frederick's aunt, Charlotte, sister of Christian VIII., was therefore next heir to the throne of that kingdom, in the event of Frederick's death. Charlotte was the mother of Frederick, Landgrave of Hesse, who had married in 1844 the Grand Duchess Alexandra, daughter of the Emperor Nicholas; and hence the Imperial family of Russia had obtained a near interest in the Danish succession. On the other hand, Duke Christian, of Schleswig-Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg, as the nearest male agnate of the Danish Royal Family, began to entertain hopes of succeeding in Schleswig and Holstein, and did everything that lay in his power to support the German party in those Duchies. But in 1846, King Christian VIII., in the interests of Russian policy, issued letters-patent extending the Danish law of female succession to the whole of his dominions, thus annihilating with the stroke of a pen all the hopes of the German party in Schleswig and Holstein.

The Germans now began an agitation on this subject, in which they confounded the totally distinct rights of Schleswig and Holstein. The latter Duchy having an entirely German population,

[5] The Danish crown was made transmissible *en quenouille* at the same time that it was made hereditary (in 1660). See Vol. III. p. 119.

and being a member of the German Confederation, its affairs came properly under the consideration of the German Diet. With Schleswig, the case was entirely different. That Duchy was ceded to Canute, King of Denmark and England, by the Emperor Conrad II., in 1030, when the boundary of the Eyder was re-established as the natural one of Denmark; while Holstein did not come under the dominion of the Danish Crown till 1460, in the reign of Christian I., Count of Oldenburg, who had claims on the female side. The German *Bund* had no right to interfere with the internal affairs of Schleswig. At most, as an international, not a national question, it had a right to demand that the claims of the German agnates to the succession should be respected. About half the inhabitants of Schleswig, however, speak Low German, and this portion of the population desired that the union of the two Duchies should be maintained, and that both should, if possible, be incorporated with the German *Bund*. This sufficed to produce in Germany an agitation in their favour, especially as the question opened up the prospect of territorial aggrandisement, and the acquisition of ports on the North Sea. The rights of the two Duchies were confounded, and the enthusiasm of the Germans was excited by articles in newspapers and by the popular song *Schleswig-Holstein meer-umschlungen*. Meetings were held in Holstein, and the German Diet promised that the rights of the *Bund* and the succession of the legal agnates should be asserted. A meeting in Holstein was dispersed by the Danish military; but the peace was not further disturbed, and matters remained in this posture till the death of Christian VIII., January 20th 1848. He was succeeded by his son, Frederick VII., and a few weeks after, the French Revolution broke out.

This event not only inflamed the Schleswig-Holstein question, but also, as we have said, set all Germany in combustion. In the smaller States it displayed itself in a desire for German unity, while in the Austrian dominions it produced an insurrection of the Hungarians, Slavonians, and Italians. Revolutionary symptoms first appeared on the banks of the Rhine. At Mannheim the people assembled and demanded a German Parliament, the freedom of the press, and the arming of the people. Similar disturbances took place at Karlsruhe. A day or two after, Welker further demanded in the Chamber of the States of Baden that the *Bund* should abrogate all its unpopular resolutions, that the military should take an oath to the Constitution, that persons of all religious denominations should be placed on a footing of perfect political equality, that ministers should be made responsible, that

all feudal burthens still remaining should be abolished, that taxation should be more equally distributed, that labour should be protected, and lastly, that the ministry should be purified. These resolutions became the programme of the Revolutionists throughout Germany. The peasants from the surrounding country had flocked in crowds to Karlsruhe, and in the following night the hotel of the Foreign Minister was burnt down. The Grand Duke of Baden now promised everything demanded. Similar movements took place in Darmstadt and Nassau. In the Electorate of Hesse, a "Commission of the People" was established at Hanau, which threatened to depose the Elector if he did not grant all their demands within three days. On the 10th of March everything was conceded. Similar concessions were made in Oldenburg, Brunswick, and other of the smaller States. The Governments of the larger middle States, Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, alone opposed any resistance to the people, till Austria and Prussia were likewise observed to be in confusion. Commotions also arose in Switzerland, where Radicalism was now triumphant. The seven Catholic Cantons, Lucerne, Schwytz, Uri, Unterwalden, Zug, Freiburg, and the Valais, had in 1846 united against the attacks of the others, and formed what was called the *Sonderbund*; but this league was soon overthrown by the Swiss Radicals under Dufour. In 1848, *Free Bands* were organised in Switzerland to aid the establishment of a Republic in Germany. Applications were also made to the French Government for aid in that project, which, however, was refused.

The leaders of the Opposition in various German Chambers held a meeting at Heidelberg, March 8th, and published a proclamation to the German people, promising them a national representation, and inviting them to attend a grand assembly, or as they called it, *Vor-parlament*, in which a representative system was to be prepared. The smaller German Sovereigns met the movement by making the leaders of the Constitutionalists their ministers, or by appointing them to the Diet. Austria and Prussia concerted together a reform of the Confederation, and published a declaration, March 10th, that a Congress of Princes would assemble at Dresden on the 15th to take the proposed reform in hand. But the Congress was prevented by Austria herself becoming absorbed in the revolutionary vortex.

The whole strength of that vast but ill-compacted empire seemed to collapse in a single day. When the news of the French Revolution arrived in Hungary, Kossuth carried, in the Diet at Pesth an address to the Emperor, March 3rd, demanding "a

National Government, purged from all foreign influence." Addresses for reform were also got up in Vienna itself, in some of which the dismissal of Metternich was demanded. Kossuth had agents in the Austrian capital, who read to the Viennese his address to the Hungarian Diet. After a slight attempt to put down the people by force, that method was abandoned, and the Archduke Louis, the Emperor's uncle, advised him to yield to their demands. Prince Metternich now quitted Vienna for London, and the Emperor granted freedom of the press, a national guard, and a Liberal Constitution for the whole Empire. A national guard was immediately formed, and kept the mob in order. Kossuth made a sort of triumphal entry into Vienna by torch-light, March 15th, at the head of a numerous Hungarian deputation, which, accompanied by several thousand armed men, with banners and music, proceeded to the Burg to deliver the Hungarian address to the Emperor.

Riots also occurred in several parts of Prussia, as Breslau, Königsberg, Erfurt. At Berlin, meetings were held in the Thiergarten, at which addresses to the King were prepared. The Prussian Government at first resorted to military force to disperse these assemblies, and some blood was shed. But at the news of what was passing in Vienna, the King announced, March 17th, freedom of the press, the assembly of a *Landstag*, or Diet, for April 2nd, the conversion of the German *Staatenbund* (confederation of States) into a *Bundesstaat* (Confederated State), and the incorporation of East and West Prussia and Posen in the *Bund*. But the people further required the formation of a burgher-guard, the withdrawal of the military from the town, and the dismissal of the ministry. These demands were carried to the palace by a great multitude, when the King appeared on the balcony and promised that everything should be conceded. In consequence, however, of some misunderstanding, an affray with the military suddenly commenced, barricades were thrown up, and a riot ensued which lasted all night, in which upwards of 200 persons lost their lives. Henry von Arnim, who had been Prussian ambassador at Paris during the Revolution, and was now made Foreign Minister, advised the King to put himself at the head of the people. William, Prince of Prussia, the King's brother, fled from Berlin, and the people wrote on his palace, "National property."

Part of the Prussian ministry, at least, had resolved on an attempt to place Frederick William IV. at the head of the new German nationality, and that monarch lent himself to the project

with the same feeble mixture of covetousness and irresolution which his father had displayed with regard to the filching of Hanover. On the 21st of March the army assumed the German cockade in addition to the Prussian; the King rode through the streets decorated with the three German colours, preceded by the students carrying a banner of the Empire with the double eagle. In proclamations addressed "To my people," and "To the German nation," it was declared "that Prussia rises into Germany," and that "the Princes and States of Germany shall deliberate in common, as an assembly of German States, as to the regeneration and refoundation of Germany." The King rejected, indeed, the titles of "Emperor" and of "King of the Germans," which had been given him in one of these proclamations. But he yielded entirely to the demands for internal reform. The bodies of those who had fallen, March 18th, were conducted to the grave in a solemn procession, which the King beheld from his balcony; and Sydow, the preacher, pronounced a funeral oration over them. On the same day the King granted all the demands of the Baden scheme already described. Riots broke out at the same time in other parts of Prussia, and especially the Rhenish provinces; to pacify which, Camphausen, of Cologne, was appointed head of the ministry.

The proceedings at Berlin on the 21st of March produced a bad impression in Germany. Frederick William's attempt at usurpation was received with the unconcealed scorn of all parties at Vienna, Munich, and Stuttgardt. But his concessions to his people, as well as the revolution at Vienna, prevented the Saxon, Hanoverian, and Bavarian Governments from any longer opposing the demands of their subjects. The King of Hanover granted the Baden scheme of reform. The King of Saxony, on the news of Metternich's dismissal, immediately appointed a Liberal ministry. In Bavaria, the old King, Louis, abdicated in favour of his son, Maximilian II., March 20th. At Munich, in addition to the other revolutionary elements which prevailed throughout Germany, the King had made himself unpopular by a scandalous amour with Lola Montez, an Hiberno-Spanish opera-dancer.

The *Vor-parlament* (preliminary Parliament) was opened in the Paul's Church at Frankfort, March 31st. It consisted, for the most part, of Opposition members from the Chambers of the middling and smaller German States, but many nondescript persons were admitted. There were but few Prussian members, and Austria was represented only by Wiesner, a Jew writer. Hacker, Struve, and other violent democrats, aimed at a German republic,

or, at all events, the establishment of a German parliament, from which princes were to be excluded. But as these princes were at the head of large standing armies, it is difficult to see how this project was to be accomplished. The cowardice, boasting, drunkenness, and other vices of the German democrats, made them contemptible from the beginning; and, though they succeeded in creating a great deal of disorder, they never had a chance of success. In all their skirmishes with the regular troops they were invariably defeated.

The effects of the movement manifested themselves in Schleswig and Holstein by a demand for union, with a separate Constitution, and the admission of Schleswig into the German *Bund*. A Provisional Government for the two Duchies was appointed, March 24th, with the Duke of Augustenburg, Count Reventlow, and Beseler at the head. Frederick William IV. assured the Duke of Augustenburg by letter that he would protect his title, and that he approved the union of Schleswig with Holstein. The Prussian army had been offended by their dismissal from Berlin; a war with Denmark might obliterate the feeling as well as restore the King's popularity. The Diet at Frankfort adopted the Prussian view, authorised Prussia to interfere in the Danish question, and admitted into their assembly a deputy from Schleswig-Holstein. The Prussian and Hanoverian troops of the *Bund* defeated the Danes in several battles; and on May 18th General Wrangel entered Jutland, and enforced a contribution of three million dollars. He contemplated holding that province as a material guarantee for the compliance of the Danes with the German demands; but on May 26th he received an order of recall, and the progress of the campaign was arrested, owing, it is thought, to Russian influence.

In Sweden, the tranquillity which had prevailed ever since the restoration of the Bourbons to the throne of France, was not now disturbed. The Crown-Prince, Charles John (Bernadotte), had succeeded to the Swedish throne, with the title of Charles XIV., on the death of Charles XIII. in 1818; and, in conjunction with the Four Estates, had ruled with wisdom and moderation. Charles XIV. died in 1844, and was succeeded by his son Oscar. During the Dano-German conflict, Oscar offered his mediation, and on its rejection by the Germans, promised the Danes his aid. The pretensions of the Germans to Schleswig were also condemned by the Norwegians. As Prussia, which suffered from the Danish blockade, did not seem inclined to follow up her victories, the Ministry of the Empire resolved, July 1st, to raise an army of

the Bund, to carry out the German pretensions without her aid. The contingents of Würtemburg and Baden began their march for the North at the beginning of August, but on the 7th of that month the Archduke John, who had been elected *Reichsverweser*, or Vicar of the new German Empire, gave the King of Prussia full powers to negociate an armistice with the Danes. Prussia had accepted Swedish mediation, and Conferences were going on, which resulted, August 26th, in the armistice of Malmö. The King of Denmark consented that during this armistice, which was to last for seven months, Schleswig and Holstein should have a common government; half to be appointed by himself, and the other half by the King of Prussia, on behalf of the *Bund*. The German Parliament at Frankfort, after some show of resistance, found itself compelled to accept the armistice.

The revolution at Vienna naturally set all Italy in a flame. But here we must recapitulate a few of the leading events which had occurred since our last notice of that peninsula.

In 1838, the Emperor Ferdinand had caused himself to be crowned, at Milan, King of Lombardy and Venice, and in the same year the French had evacuated Ancona. The dominion of Austria seemed to be sufficiently stable in Northern Italy, so long as peace with France was preserved, to assure the tranquillity, or the servitude, of the other Italian States. But under the surface glowed a volcano of faction. Mazzini had founded a secret league called *La giovane Italia*, the object of which was to emancipate Italy from the yoke of foreigners. In 1840, when the affairs of the East threatened a breach between France and the Northern Powers, the Italians had begun to stir; and partial attempts at insurrection had subsequently been made in 1843 and 1845. The death of Pope Gregory XVI. in June 1846, seemed to open brighter prospects to the patriots of Italy. The Conclave chose for his successor Cardinal Mastai Ferretti, who assumed the title of Pius IX. The new Pope began his reign with some liberal measures, which made him very popular in Italy. He granted amnesties, deposed all unpopular magistrates, allowed a greater liberty of the press. It was an opinion entertained by many, that the unity and independence of Italy could be achieved only by means of the Pope; and it was hoped that Pius IX. might be induced to head the league of "Young Italy:" but there was an afterthought that the tool should be thrown aside when it had answered the purpose. The club called *Circolo Romano* took up this idea, pretended a great affection for the Pope, and cheered him when he appeared in public. Pio Nono consented to a sort of Parliament, and to the

formation of a *guardia civica*, or burgher-guard. He even entertained the idea of an Italian *Zoll-verein*, or customs-union, as a prelude to political unity. Leopold II., Grand Duke of Tuscany, was also induced by some popular demonstrations to authorise a burgher-guard, and certain political reforms. Austria, however, warned the Pope as to his proceedings. That Power garrisoned the citadel of Ferrara, agreeably to the Treaties of 1815; but she now proceeded to occupy the whole town; an act against which Pius was persuaded to protest, and even to make preparations for war.

Charles Albert, King of Sardinia, also announced about this time some liberal measures. In November 1847, he concluded a customs-union with Rome and Tuscany, and in February 1848 he granted a new Constitution to his subjects. On the North he cultivated the friendship of the Swiss. The South of Italy had been disturbed before the French Revolution. An insurrection had broken out at Palermo, January 12th 1848, and on the 29th in Naples, when King Ferdinand II. granted a Constitution. The principles of Mazzini also pervaded Austrian Italy. The Austrian Government affected mildness, but it is difficult to reconcile men to a foreign yoke. A crusade was got up against tobacco, the sale of which was an Austrian monopoly, by a renunciation of smoking; and at the beginning of 1848 all intercourse with Austrian officers was broken off. At this time the apathetic Archduke Rainer was viceroy in the Austrian dominions in Italy, while Marshal Radetzki, then eighty-two years of age, held the military command. Radetzki had seen the storm coming, and had in vain besought his Government for reinforcements, as well as that Milan, Verona, and other places should be strengthened. The Archduke left Milan for Vienna, March 17th, and on the evening of the same day the insurrection in that capital was publicly known at Milan. Next morning Casati, the Podestà, the Archbishop of Milan, and Count Borromeo, the chief of the Lombard nobles, who had long been initiated in the conspiracy, displayed the three-coloured flag, and demanded from Count O'Donnel, who conducted the Government in the absence of the Archduke, that, as had been done in Vienna, he should assent to all the demands of the Lombard people. As O'Donnel hesitated, the Podestà apprehended him, while the people threw up barricades. A street fight ensued, which lasted four days; during which the troops suffered so severely that Radetzki withdrew them, except at the gates and in the citadel. His force consisted of only 20,000 men; Charles Albert of Sardinia was approaching with his whole army; and Radetzki, feeling that he was

not strong enough to hold the insurgent town, evacuated it on the night of March 22nd.

Charles Albert had received no injury from Austria; but the opportunity was too tempting to be lost. He declared war, took possession of Milan, and pursued the retreating Radetzki; who, after reducing to ashes the little town of Melegnano, which had obstructed his retreat, and withdrawing the garrisons from several places, took up a strong position between the Minçio and the Adige, in the triangle formed by the fortresses of Mantua, Peschiera, and Verona; where he awaited reinforcements from Germany. The Austrian garrisons in Brescia, Cremona, Como, Padua, Treviso, Udine, surrendered. Venice was lost through the cowardice of the commandant. A capitulation was entered into with the insurgent people, the Austrians left the city, and the advocate Manin placed himself at the head of the restored republic.

Charles Albert, though called the *Spada d' Italia*, or sword of Italy, and though his forces far outnumbered those of Radetzki, ventured not a battle. He hoped that his connection with the revolutionists at Vienna would obtain for him the gift of Italy, which all parties agreed must be wrested from Austria, though they differed as to what was to be done with it. Radetzki could expect no aid from Vienna, where the Government was in a state of dissolution. Count Kolowrat, the hope of the Liberals, had succeeded to Metternich's place, but could not conjure the storm. The Archduke Louis resigned the conduct of affairs to the Archduke Francis Charles, who ruled with as weak a hand, and Kolowrat was succeeded by Count Ficquelmont. Kossuth, in order to wrest Hungary from Austria, endeavoured to perpetuate the disturbances at Vienna. The Emperor Ferdinand had promised the Hungarians many reforms, and even permitted a national ministry, independent of that at Vienna, of which Count Batthyani was the head, while Kossuth administered the finances. Kossuth demanded for Hungary the Baden scheme of reform, which would give the aristocracy their last blow. He also required the incorporation of Transylvania with Hungary, a national Hungarian bank and the exclusion of Austrian paper money; also, that Hungarian troops should not serve the Emperor out of the Austrian dominions. The Diet at Pesth, overawed by the aspect of affairs, in its last sitting, April 11th, at which the Emperor Ferdinand was present, gave all these demands the force of law, an act of political suicide on the part of the Hungarian aristocracy.

The Bohemians also demanded a new Constitution and reforms very similar to those required by the Hungarians. Professor

Palacky, the historian of Bohemia, was the soul of the Tschech party, as Kossuth was of the Magyar movement in Hungary. Palacky was invited by the *Vor-parlament* to take his seat among them; but he declared that he was a Tschech, and would not meddle with German affairs. The Bohemians invited Ferdinand to Prague, as the riots still continued at Vienna; but he took refuge in preference at Innsbrück among his faithful Tyrolese. The suppression of a riot at Prague, by Prince Windischgrätz, in June, was the first reactionary triumph of the Imperial arms. Nor did Charles Albert, in spite of his numerical superiority, make much progress in Lombardy. Garibaldi had raised about 8000 volunteers; but the King of Sardinia, dreading the triumph of the Mazzinists and Republicans, did not encourage the arming of the people. He sent 2000 men to assist and secure Venice, but that city preferred to remain a republic. As at one time the Austrian Government seemed disposed to surrender, Charles Albert refused to join a league of the Italian States proposed by the Pope.

After the revolution at Paris, the movements already in progress in Central and Southern Italy broke into a perfect storm. Pius IX. in some degree allayed it at Rome by announcing a new Constitution for that city, including a temporal ministry and a chamber of deputies (March 15th). But at the news of the revolution at Vienna the Romans were seized with a sort of fury. All flew to arms; the Palazzo di Venezia was stormed, and the Austrian double eagle torn down. The Pope despatched his troops under Durando, with a considerable body of volunteers under Colonel Ferrari, to his northern frontier, for the avowed purpose of defence; but Durando led them over the Po to join Charles Albert, when Pius, in alarm, asserted in an allocution, April 29th, that he had given his troops no such orders. Such, however, was the force of the democratic movement in Austria, that the Pope's consent was extorted to make common cause with Charles Albert, but on condition that the latter Sovereign should join the Italian league, which, as we have said, he declined. The same spirit prevailed in Tuscany as at Rome, and hence also a small army of 7000 men was despatched. In Modena, the Duke was driven from his dominions.

Before the French Revolution broke out, the King of Naples had already granted a Constitution to his subjects, February 10th 1848, while in the preceding January, Sicily had separated from that country and declared its independence. Lord Minto, who had been sent into Italy in a semi-official capacity by the British

Government, endeavoured in vain to reconcile the Sicilians and the King. The Jesuits were now driven from Naples; the Austrian arms at the Embassy were torn down; and, as the King could give him no satisfaction, Prince Felix Schwarzenberg, the Austrian ambassador, took his departure. Ferdinand II. was at length compelled to sanction a fresh democratic Constitution, April 3rd, when Troja, the historian, became his prime minister. War was now declared against Austria, and General Pepé sent to the North with 13,000 men; but from jealousy of Charles Albert they were directed not to cross the Po. When the Neapolitan Chambers met, May 14th, they were not contented with the new Constitution, and a fresh insurrection broke out which threatened to overturn the throne. Barricades were thrown up, and a sanguinary conflict ensued between the Swiss guards and the populace, which ended in the entire discomfiture of the insurgents. Ferdinand, after causing the people to be disarmed, withdrew the concessions which he had made in April, but retained the Constitution of February. Prince Cariati was now appointed Minister. Pepé was recalled, and directed to proceed to Sicily to restore order, but preferred to go to Venice with such of his troops as were inclined to follow him. The Swiss *Tagsatzung*, or Diet, ordered the regiments which had fought for the King at Naples to be disbanded, as having acted contrary to the honour and interest of Switzerland. But these regiments refused to quit the King's service.

Meanwhile in the North of Italy, Marshal Radetzki, having been reinforced by Count Nugent with 13,000 men, repulsed an attack made by Charles Albert at St. Lucia, May 6th. On the 29th, he defeated with great loss Laugier's Tuscan division at Curtatone; but was, in turn, defeated the following day by Charles Albert at Gaito. The Emperor Ferdinand, who was at Innsbrück, now directed Radetzki to conclude an armistice, but the Marshal ventured to disobey these orders, and wrote to his master not to despond. Peschiera surrendered to the Piedmontese, May 30th. On the other hand, Radetzki took Vicenza, June 11th. The capture of Rivoli by Charles Albert, which lies on the road from Verona into South Tyrol, was of less importance than it might seem, as Radetzki's communication with Vienna was secured more to the east. Towards the end of July the Piedmontese were defeated in several engagements, and the Austrians, having been largely reinforced, began to advance. Charles Albert now solicited a truce, which was refused. The British Government had attempted to mediate in favour of Charles Albert, and Lord Abercrombie, the English

ambassador at Turin, proceeded to the Austrian camp to negociate; but Radetzki would hear of nothing till he should have arrived at Milan. The Piedmontese retreated, or rather fled, to that town, without venturing to defend Cremona, and were defeated in a battle before the gates of the Lombard capital, August 5th, which was re-entered by Radetzki on the following day. On the 9th, he signed an armistice, by which he secured Charles Albert's frontiers. That Sovereign, on his side, surrendered Peschiera, and withdrew his troops from Venice. He had been proclaimed King in that city, July 4th, but at the news of his misfortunes the people turned, and Manin again proclaimed the Republic. Garibaldi delivered the last battle against the Austrians at Morazzone, and then fled into Switzerland. Thus all Lombardy was again subdued; Radetzki proceeded to invest Venice on the land side, and began the laborious siege of that city.

Meanwhile the German National Assembly, elected to establish a "German Constitution" without any interference on the part of the princes, had assembled at Frankfort, May 18th, when Henry von Gagern was chosen President. It would be tedious to detail the proceedings of this abortive Assembly. The majority were for restoring an Emperor, while only a minority desired a Republic. On the motion of Von Gagern, the Archduke John was elected *Reichsverweser*, or Imperial Vicar, June 29th, being thus constituted, as it were, a Præ-Emperor, as the *Vor-parlament* had been a Præ-parliament. The Archduke John entered Frankfort in state, July 11th; on the following day the Diet of the Confederation held its last sitting, and handed over its power to the Imperial Vicar. Of all the German Sovereigns, the King of Hanover alone protested against these proceedings.

The Constituent Assembly for Prussia was also opened at Berlin, May 22nd, but like the Frankfort Parliament, did nothing but talk. The expedition against Denmark had been undertaken to divert the people's attention from their own affairs. The Frankfort mob, however, did not acquiesce in the proceedings of the Parliament. A serious riot took place, August 18th, which was eventually put down by the military; but two members of the Parliament, Prince Lichnowski and General Auerswald, were killed. Riots and democratic demonstrations broke out at this time in many parts of Germany, but were suppressed without much difficulty. After the failure of the attempted insurrection at Frankfort, some of the boldest democratic leaders vanished to other places. Robert Blum, Fröbel, and others betook themselves to Vienna, to fan the embers of sedition in that capital. A "Central Committee of Democratic

Germany" published, October 3rd, a violent proclamation, repudiating and abusing the Frankfort Parliament, protesting against its existence, and summoning a "general democratic congress," to meet at Berlin on the 26th. The assembly actually met; but in the interval the courage of the talkers had oozed out, and the congress made but a sorry figure.

The hopes of the German democrats were fixed upon Vienna, where alone the people had obtained the mastery, and were supported by Kossuth with the whole strength of Hungary. The higher and richer class had quitted Vienna in the summer. A Committee of Safety and the Aula, or university, ruled side by side with the Ministry and Diet. The Austrian Constituent National Assembly, which had been opened by the Archduke John, July 22nd, shortly before he went to Frankfort, had no influence at all with the people. The insurgent Viennese were directed by Kossuth. That leader had carried in the Hungarian Diet the levy of 200,000 Honveds, or national troops, and the issue of forty-two million gulden in paper money. But the aspect of affairs began gradually to change. The Emperor Ferdinand returned to Vienna, after Radetzki's success, August 12th, and the Ministry began to take some bolder steps. In order to appease the people work had been provided for them by the Government. The wages were now reduced, and though the labourers revolted, they were put down by the municipal guard. The Government dissolved the Committee of Safety August 24th, which ventured not to resist. The Servians and Croats had taken up arms against the Hungarians in Ferdinand's cause; though Kossuth pretended to fight against them, as rebels, in the Emperor's name. At the beginning of September, Kossuth sent a deputation of 150 Hungarian gentlemen to Vienna to invite the Emperor to Pesth, and to request him to order back the Hungarian regiments from Italy to defend their country. Ferdinand, of course, declined these proposals.

The Archduke Stephen having laid down the office of Hungarian Palatine and returned to Vienna, the Emperor appointed Count Lemberg Governor of Hungary. But a party of Kossuth's scythemen murdered him on the bridge of Pesth, September 28th. No terms of course could any longer be kept. Kossuth relied for support on a revolt which had long been preparing at Vienna, and which broke out October 6th. The minister Latour was seized and murdered. The mob broke into the chamber of the National Assembly and caused an address to be drawn up to the Emperor, in which he was required to recall all the measures which had been taken against Hungary and all the powers which had been given to

Radetzki. The Government arsenal and that in the city were stormed and plundered. Next day Ferdinand fled from Schönbrunn to Olmütz, where he found a defence in the loyalty of the people and the neighbourhood of Windischgrätz and his army. That general proceeded with 30,000 men from Bohemia to Vienna to form the siege of that city; in which he was assisted by Jellachich, the Croat leader, with 35,000 men, and Auersperg with 15,000. These forces completely surrounded Vienna, which, after a week's siege, was taken by assault, October 31st. Some of the captured leaders of the insurrection were shot, among them Robert Blum. A revolution now ensued at Court. Prince Felix Schwarzenberg became prime minister, November 24th, and on December 2nd 1848 the Emperor Ferdinand I. abdicated in favour of his nephew, Francis Joseph. The motive assigned for this step was, that younger powers were required to carry out the necessary reforms in the State.

The suppression of the insurrection at Vienna produced a reaction at Berlin. On November 4th the King empowered Count Brandenburg, a natural son of Frederick William II., to form a new ministry. On the 8th the so-called Constituent Assembly was ordered to transfer itself to the town of Brandenburg, and on the 10th General Wrangel entered Berlin with a numerous force, without experiencing any resistance. At the news of these proceedings riots ensued in various parts of Germany, which were not, however, attended with any important results. The Constituent Assembly was opened at Brandenburg November 27th; but in consequence of their tumultuous debates, the King dissolved them, December 5th, and granted a Constitution by his own grace and favour. The legislature was to consist of two chambers, and writs were issued for elections in the ensuing February.

In Austria, the first care of the new Emperor was the reduction of Hungary. That commission was intrusted to Prince Windischgrätz, who began the campaign in the middle of December. Kossuth ruled nearly the whole of Hungary, as President of a Committee of National Defence. The Hungarian Diet did not recognise the abdication of Ferdinand, but still called him King of Hungary, and represented Francis Joseph to the troops as a usurper. The Hungarian army was commanded by Görgey, while General Bem led the insurgents in Transylvania. As the Austrians advanced the Hungarians retreated, with the view of drawing them into the interior of the country during the bad season. Kossuth abandoned Pesth on the approach of Windischgrätz, carrying with him the crown of St. Stephen, and the Austrians entered Buda and Pesth

without opposition, January 5th 1849. Windischgrätz defeated the Hungarians under Dembinski at Kapolna, February 28th; while, on the other hand, General Bem gained several advantages over the Imperialists in Transylvania.

The state of the Austrian affairs in Hungary, and the circumstance of Radetzki being still engaged in the siege of Venice, encouraged the King of Sardinia to resume the war against Austria, at the termination of the armistice, March 12th 1849. Thus Austria would have to deal at once with the revolted Hungarians and Italians, and it was considered that the disturbances in Germany would lend a moral support to the movement. Charles Albert's army amounted to between 80,000 and 90,000 men, while that of Radetzki was not more than 60,000 or 70,000. But the best Piedmontese generals were adverse to the war, and the chief commands were, therefore, intrusted to Poles. Radetzki defeated Chrzanowski at Mortara, March 21st, and on the 23rd, inflicted on him a still more terrible defeat at Novara. Never was overthrow more speedy or more complete. On the 24th of March, Charles Albert resigned his crown in despair, and fled to Oporto, where he died a few months after. His son and successor, Victor Emanuel II., immediately besought Radetzki for a truce, which that general granted on very moderate terms, March 26th 1849. On the 28th, Radetzki again entered Milan. Brescia, which had revolted, and persisted in defending itself, was captured by Count Haynau, a natural son of the Elector of Hesse; who, from the barbarous cruelty which he exercised on the inhabitants, obtained the name of the "Hyæna of Brescia." A definitive peace was concluded between Austria and Sardinia, August 6th, by which everything was replaced on the ancient footing. The Sardinians had to pay seventy-five million francs for the costs of the war.

The Hungarian insurgents under Görgey were more successful. The Austrians were defeated in several battles, Komorn was taken, and Vienna itself was threatened. Austria now accepted the aid of Russia. This step on the part of the Emperor Nicholas was not altogether disinterested. Many Poles took part in the Hungarian war, and he apprehended lest the success of the rebels in that country should lead to a revolution in Poland. It had been decided by the new Austrian Government, March 1849, that Hungary should be deprived of its former Constitution, its separate diet, and nationality. Kossuth retorted by causing the diet assembled at Debreczin to depose the House of Habsburg-Lorraine from the throne of Hungary, and to establish a provisional republic. Windischgrätz was superseded in the command of the

Austrian army by Baron Welden; who, however, was compelled to retreat, and Görgey took Buda by storm, May 21st. But, in the middle of June, Prince Paskiewitsch entered Hungary at several points, with a Russian army of 130,000 men, and 500 guns. The Austrian army had also been reinforced, and the command again transferred to Haynau. The Hungarian army was estimated at 200,000 men, but was not equal to the combined armies of Austria and Russia.

We cannot enter into the details of the Hungarian war, which ended with the complete reduction of the Hungarians in the autumn of 1849. The division of the Hungarian army under Dembinski, with which was Kossuth, having been annihilated by Haynau, Kossuth, having first resigned his power into the hands of Görgey, betook himself to the protection of that general, August 11th. Görgey, who was no republican, loved him not; and Kossuth, instead of fulfilling his promise to give up the Hungarian crown and jewels, fled with them to General Bem in Transylvania. On the 12th August, Görgey surrendered by capitulation with his whole army of 23,000 men, to the Russian General Rüdiger. Bem having only 6000 men, both he and Kossuth now fled into Turkey, where they found protection, in spite of the Russian and Austrian demands for their extradition. Kossuth, and several other fugitives, afterwards proceeded to England. The Hungarian divisions now surrendered one after another. Görgey obtained, through Russian mediation, permission to reside at Grätz; but Haynau took a cruel and sanguinary revenge on other leaders of the revolution. He condemned Batthyani to the gallows, and went half mad with rage, on learning that the unfortunate count had only been shot at Buda. He caused Prince Wroniski and two others to be hanged at Pesth, and the Generals Becsey, Aulich, Leiningen, with several more, at Arad; some, by way of favour, he only ordered to be shot. The Emperor was obliged to recall him. This man was afterwards imprudent enough to come to England; when the treatment which he received at the hands of some of Messrs. Barclay and Perkins' men, will be in the recollection of some of our readers.

Austria, after quelling the Lombard and Hungarian insurrections, was at leisure to attend to the affairs of Central Italy. In Rome, since the spring of 1848, the Pope had been compelled to accept the temporal and liberal ministry of Mamiani. After the success of the Austrians in Upper Italy, Pio Nono ventured again to assert his pontifical authority. His principal adviser was Count Rossi, the French ambassador, though an Italian by birth. Rossi

subsequently became the Pope's Prime Minister, and endeavoured to restore things to their ancient footing; but he was assassinated, November 15th, when about to enter the newly-opened National Assembly. Upon this, the people, aided by the papal troops, as well as by the civic guard, stormed Pius in the Quirinal, murdered his private secretary, Cardinal Palma, and extorted the dismissal of the Swiss guards, and the appointment of a popular ministry. The Pope, with the aid of Count Spaur, the Bavarian ambassador, succeeded in escaping from the Quirinal, disguised as one of the count's livery servants, and betook himself to Gaëta, whither he was followed by his ministers. The Roman Parliament having in vain required him to return, at length proceeded to establish a Provisional Government, or Junta of State, consisting of the triumvirate, Counts Corsini, Camerata, and Galetti (December 19th). The Pope protested against all their acts as illegal. At this time, Garibaldi entered Rome at the head of a large body of volunteers. In Tuscany, also, the Grand Duke had been compelled to accept a democratic ministry, which aimed at establishing a republic. Sanguinary insurrections took place at Leghorn and Genoa, in December. On February 5th 1849, was opened at Rome a general Italian Constituent Assembly, with the view of establishing Italian unity under a republican form of government. In this Assembly, Mazzini played the chief part, and, after him, Prince Charles of Canino, a son of Lucien Bonaparte. But, at the time of the Pope's flight, Prince Louis Napoleon, afterwards the French President, had expressed his sympathy for the Church, and repudiated the proceedings of his cousin; and General Cavaignac promised Pius that he would assist him. The Constituent Assembly began by deposing the Pope as a temporal prince, and proclaiming the Roman Republic, February 8th. The executive power of the new republic was placed in the hands of the triumvirate, Mazzini, Armellini, and Saffi, who decreed the confiscation of all church property. In Florence, also, the Grand Duke fled, Guerazzi proclaimed a Republic, and was named Dictator.

After the overthrow of Charles Albert, however, a reaction commenced. The Austrians began to enter Central Italy; France and Spain also despatched troops to the Pope's aid; whilst Victor Emanuel, the new King of Sardinia, sent an army to reduce the republicans of Genoa. At Florence, a counter-revolution broke out, and Guerazzi was compelled to fly.

In June, Parma, Bologna, and Ancona, were successively occupied by the Austrians, who, however, at Rome, were anticipated by the French. A division of 6000 French troops under

General Oudinot had landed at Cività Vecchia, April 25th, and a few days later, a few thousand Spaniards landed at Terracina. The King of Naples also advanced against Rome. That the new French Republic should begin its career with coercing its fellow Republicans at Rome, showed how vast was the difference between the revolution of 1848 and that of 1792. Oudinot found a reception he had little anticipated. He experienced a signal defeat before the walls of Rome from Garibaldi's volunteers, April 30th; upon which the King of Naples withdrew his troops. Oudinot now procured a truce in order to reinforce himself, while Lesseps, the French ambassador, endeavoured to cajole the Romans. When these purposes were answered, Lesseps was disavowed, and, in spite of Garibaldi's heroic defence, Oudinot captured Rome, July 3rd. Garibaldi succeeded in escaping, and embarked near S. Marinello for Genoa. Mazzini also escaped. He had previously been obliged to lay down his power in favour of a new triumvirate, consisting of Salicetti, Mariani, and Calandretti; who concluded the capitulation with the French. The Spaniards did not venture to approach Rome. General Oudinot, after his entrance, established a government in the name of the Pope, and thus *de facto* put an end to the Roman Republic. Pius himself, however, not relishing the protection of French bayonets, remained at Gaëta; nor would he consent to make such concessions as the French Government desired, in order to avert the unpopularity of the expedition among the liberal party in France. The Grand Duke of Tuscany returned to his capital, July 29th. Venice, which had endured a siege since the summer of 1848, was not reduced by the Austrians till August 22nd 1849, partly by bombardment, partly through the effects of famine. The Austrians were computed to have lost 20,000 men during the siege, principally by marsh fever. Manin, and forty of the most compromised of the Venetian republicans, were permitted to withdraw.

Although Naples had been reduced, Sicily continued in a state of rebellion. In July 1848 the Sicilians, at the suggestion, it is said, of Lord Minto, chose Duke Ferdinand of Genoa, brother of Victor Emanuel, for their King; but that Prince declined to accept the proffered crown. Prince Filangieri, with a Neapolitan army, landed at Messina, and captured that town after a sanguinary struggle, September 7th. In the spring of 1849 Filangieri reduced Catania and Syracuse, and on April 23rd he entered Palermo, thus putting an end to the rebellion.

We must now revert to the affairs of Germany, where the German Parliament had by a small majority elected the King of Prussia

hereditary Emperor, March 28th 1849; a dignity, however, which Frederick William IV. declined to accept. After this election Austria withdrew her representatives from the Parliament. The debates at Frankfort were accompanied with disturbances in many parts of Germany. Riots first broke out at Dresden, May 3rd, where the King of Saxony had dismissed the Radical Chamber and established a strong ministry. At first the people had the mastery. The Royal Family fled in the night to Königstein, and a provisional government was constituted under the triumvirate, Tschirner, Heubner, and Todt. By the aid of Prussian and other troops the rebellion, however, was put down, May 9th. An attempted insurrection at Leipsic also failed. Berlin was not again disturbed, but riots, attended with loss of life, occurred in many of the smaller towns. On May 14th, Frederick William IV. directed all Prussian subjects to quit the Frankfort Parliament, and a similar order was issued a few days after by the King of Saxony. That assembly was also reduced, by the voluntary desertion of other members, to little more than 100 persons; who, deeming themselves no longer secure in Frankfort, transferred their sittings to Stuttgardt early in June. Here they deposed the Imperial Vicar, and appointed a new Regency, consisting of five members. But, as they began to call the people to arms, they were dispersed by the Würtemberg Government. The insurgents, under Mierolowski, held out for some time in the Palatinate and Baden; but towards the end of June the Prussians compelled them to disperse and take refuge in Switzerland. The Swiss Confederate Council, however, by a decree of July 16th, directed the ringleaders to quit that country.

In the spring of 1849, the war had again broken out in Schleswig-Holstein. Denmark was dissatisfied with the arrangement by which, after the armistice of Malmö, the Duchies had been conjointly administered under the presidency of Count Reventlow; nor were England and Russia willing that Schleswig should be ravished from Denmark, its rightful Sovereign. Denmark denounced the armistice, April 26th. The campaign commenced with the loss, by the Danes, of two of their best ships at Eckenförde; while on land they were shortly after defeated at Kolding by General Bonin and the army of the Bund. Bonin, however, was in turn defeated by the Danes under General Rye at Fredericia, July 6th. England and Russia now interfered, and dictated a fresh armistice of six months on the basis of the separation of Schleswig and Holstein, July 10th.

Meanwhile the new French Republic was peacefully consolidating itself. The clubs were suppressed, part of the *garde mobile*

dismissed; Blanqui, Raspail, and other agitators were condemned by the Court of Assizes at Bourges. In the spring of 1849, Louis Napoleon conciliated the Church by despatching to Rome the expedition under General Oudinot already mentioned, with the collateral view of establishing in Italy a counterpoise to Austrian influence, and making the arms of France respected.

The newly-elected Legislative Assembly met at Paris, May 28th 1849. More than half the chamber were new members, and many who had taken a leading part in the Revolution were not returned. Among those excluded were Lamartine and Marrast. The Red Republicans and Socialists were furious; Ledru Rollin violently attacked the President's policy, nay even sought to impeach him. The ill success at first of Oudinot at Rome favoured an attempt to excite a general insurrection. The Republicans of the Opposition, called the Mountain, consisting of about 120 members, invited the national guard to make a procession, though unarmed, to the Assembly, in order to remind it of its duties (June 13th). But the President had taken the necessary military precautions, and Changarnier, at the head of the troops, dispersed the procession and destroyed the barricades which had been commenced. The insurgents were also driven from the Conservatory of Arts, where they had opened a sort of Convention, and named Ledru Rollin Dictator. Several of the ringleaders were apprehended, while Ledru Rollin only saved himself by flight. The Paris insurrection was thus suppressed, as well as another which occurred the same day at Lyon; the latter, however, not without considerable bloodshed. After these events, the republican journals were in part suppressed, and the remainder subjected by a new law to more rigid control.

In the summer of 1849 the President made several tours in the provinces. His policy assumed more and more a conservative tendency. Early in December he made some partial changes in the ministry, and announced his intention to be firm; such, he said, had been the wish of France in choosing him. Many former adherents of the Bourbons now joined him, as Thiers, Molé, Broglie, Berryer, Montalembert, and others; but only in the hope that a restoration of one of the old lines might be effected. Most of the *projets de loi* which the President submitted to the Assembly were directed against liberty; such as higher securities for the journals, the leading articles of which were ordered to be signed, the limitation of the elective franchise, a severe law for the transportation of political offenders, &c. The Chamber tamely submitted, and voted the President, though exceptionally for a year,

a salary of 2,160,000 francs, instead of 600,000. Out of this supply he defrayed the expense of the military feasts, in which he was toasted as the "Emperor." His plans were promoted by dread and hatred of Socialism, and his government even became popular, because it insured tranquillity, with employment and prosperity as its consequences. But the basis of his power was fixed chiefly in the provinces, which now for the first time possessed more influence than Paris.

The Pretender, Henry V., Duke of Bordeaux, who in his exile used only the modest title of Count de Chambord, visited Wiesbaden in August 1850, where he was soon surrounded by the leading legitimists of France. He was persuaded to publish a foolish manifesto. In the same month the ex-King, Louis Philippe, expired at Claremont (August 26th). He left his family not altogether at unity. The Count de Paris, the claimant of the French throne, resided in Germany, at a distance from his relatives.

Another change in the French Administration took place in January 1851, the chief feature of which was the dismissal of General Changarnier. It had been observed that in the reviews of the preceding autumn, all the regiments had shouted "*Vive l'Empereur*" except those commanded by Changarnier. The Assembly, however, began to show symptoms of resistance. A vote was carried of non-confidence in the new Ministry, which was again changed; and in February a proposal for increasing the President's salary was rejected. But this opposition only stimulated Louis Napoleon in his purpose. Petitions came up from all parts of France demanding a revision of the Constitution, or, in plain words, an Empire instead of a Republic; but were rejected by the Chamber. When the Chamber was reopened in November, the President again demanded a revision of the Constitution, in order, as he intimated, to regulate legally what the French people would otherwise know how to obtain in another manner. He alluded to the support which he might expect from the clergy, the agricultural and manufacturing interests, and above all from the troops; and he hinted the influence of his name among the army, of which, according to the Constitution, he alone had the disposal. If the Assembly would not vote the revision of the Constitution, the people would, in 1852, when the term of his Presidency expired, express its new decision; that is, in other words, he would be proclaimed Emperor by universal suffrage.

The struggle between the President and the Chambers continued in 1851, in which year the Ministry was repeatedly changed. A government project to modify the electoral law of May 31st 1850,

and to restore universal suffrage, having been rejected by the Assembly in November, and a measure having been brought forward for determining the responsibility of the Ministers and of the head of the State, Louis Napoleon resolved on a *coup d'état*. The soldiery were devoted to him, he had surrounded himself with able generals who favoured his cause, and he relied on the disunion which reigned among his opponents. M. de Thorigny, who refused to lend himself to the proposed *coup d'état*, was superseded as Minister of the Interior by M. de Morny. On the night of December 1st, the President, in order to divert attention, gave a grand party, during which the troops were distributed in readiness for action, the Government presses were employed in printing placards and proclamations, and arrests were quietly effected of all such generals, deputies, and other persons whose opposition might prove troublesome. Among those arrested were Generals Cavaignac, Changarnier, Lamoricière, Bédeau, and others; Messrs. Thiers, Roger du Nord, Victor Hugo, Eugène Sue, &c. The prisoners were carried, some to Vincennes, some to Ham, in those cage-like carriages used for the conveyance of persons sentenced to transportation. On the morning of December 2nd, placards appeared upon the walls of Paris containing the following decrees: "The National Assembly is dissolved, universal suffrage is re-established, the Elective Colleges are summoned to meet on the 14th of December, the first military division (Paris and the Department of the Seine) is placed in a state of siege, the Council of State is dissolved." These decrees were accompanied with an Address to the people, proposing a responsible chief, to be named for ten years, and other changes. If the people were discontented with the President's acts, they must choose another person; but if they confided to him a great mission, they must give him the means of fulfilling it. Another proclamation was addressed to the army, in which Louis Napoleon reminded them of the disdain with which they had been treated during the reign of Louis Philippe, that they had now an opportunity to recover their ancient consideration as the *élite* of the nation, that their history was identified with his own by a preceding community of glory and misfortunes.

On the appearance of these proclamations, the Deputies, to the number of 252, among whom was Odillon Barrot, finding the Palais Bourbon, their usual place of meeting, occupied by troops, assembled at the Mayoralty of the 10th Arrondissement, and resolved, on the motion of M. Berryer, to depose the President, and to give General Oudinot the command of the army. But they were all surrounded and taken into custody by the Chasseurs

de Vincennes. Some resistance was attempted and a few barricades erected, but not of the requisite strength; and the troops, under General Magnan, easily overcame all resistance. Those captured with arms in their hands were shot on the spot. The fear of anarchy induced the upper and middling classes to support Napoleon: the national guard remained passive.

The Revolution was favourably received at Vienna, St. Petersburg, and Berlin. Napoleon surrounded himself with a consultative Commission, into which were admitted all the notabilities that were inclined to adhere to him. M. Léon Faucher alone refused to be nominated. Matters took the course which had been anticipated. Before the end of December, Napoleon was elected President for ten years by nearly seven and a half million votes, while only 640,737 were recorded against him. He now released the adversaries whom he had imprisoned. General Cavaignac was allowed to return to Paris; Changarnier, Lamoricière, Victor Hugo, Thiers, and the rest were banished: but M. Thiers was shortly after permitted to return. Rioters taken in arms were transported *en masse* to Cayenne.

It now only remained to prepare the way for the grand final step, the assumption of Imperial power. Early in 1852 the gilt eagles of the first Napoleon were restored on the standards of the army; the national guard was dissolved and reconstituted on a new system; the trees of liberty and other Republican emblems were removed from the public places; the name of Napoleon was substituted for that of the Republic in the prayers of the Church. On the 15th of January the new Constitution was promulgated, which, though it professed to confirm the principles of 1789, was a return to the system of the first Napoleon. The whole Executive power was vested in the President, who was to be advised in descending degrees by a State Council, a Senate of nobles, and a completely powerless Legislative Assembly, whose transactions, at the demand of five members, might be secret. Napoleon confiscated the greater part of the possessions of the House of Orleans, and ordered that the remainder of them should be sold by the family itself before the expiration of the year. De Morny, with his colleagues, Roucher, Fould, and Dupin, who did not approve this measure, resigned; but their places were soon supplied by other Ministers devoted to Napoleon, to whom he gave large salaries. At a grand review, held January 21st, he distributed among the soldiers medals which entitled the holders of them to one hundred francs yearly. The Universities were reformed, the Professors deprived of the independence which they had enjoyed,

and some of them, as MM. Michelet and Edgar Quinet, were dismissed. The grateful Senate voted the President a civil list of twelve million francs, the titles of "Prince" and "Monseigneur," and the use of the Royal Palaces.

In the autumn, the President again made a long tour in the south of France, and was everywhere saluted with cries of "*Vive l'Empereur!*" On re-entering Paris in state, October 16th, whither many provincial persons had flocked, the same cry struck his ear, the emblems of the empire everywhere met his eyes. Napoleon now alighted at the palace of the Tuileries, where he fixed his residence. He directed the Senate to debate the restoration of the Empire, which had been so significantly demanded during his tour in the provinces; but it was to be sanctioned by the universal suffrage of the nation, by votes to be taken on November 21st and 22nd. On this occasion the votes recorded in his favour were 7,824,189, and those against him only 253,145. On December 2nd he was proclaimed Emperor, with the title of Napoleon III.

The Constitution of January 1852 was confirmed with some modifications. The royal title was restored to Napoleon's uncle, Jerôme Bonaparte; Generals St. Arnaud, Magnan, and Castellane were created Marshals of the Empire. All foreign courts were assured of the new Emperor's desire for peace, in token of which a reduction of 30,000 men was made in the army. England and most of the European Powers acknowledged Napoleon's title; the three Northern Courts did the same, after a short hesitation, in January 1853. On the 29th of that month, Napoleon married Donna Eugenia Montijo, Countess of Téba: on which occasion he granted an amnesty for political offences, and pardoned upwards of 3000 persons.

Meanwhile, in Germany, where the influence of Austria was restored by the extinction of the revolution, matters were gradually resuming their ancient course. The question of the German Constitution, however, still remained a cause of disunion. Austria, backed by the influence of Russia, succeeded in re-establishing the Federal Constitution with the Frankfort Diet, as arranged in 1815. But Prussia was not willing to relinquish her pretensions to take a more leading part in the affairs of the Empire. On February 26th 1850, Frederick William IV. took the oath to the new Prussian Constitution. The Prussian Government now endeavoured, in opposition to Austria, to form a new Bund, or Confederation, of which Prussia was to be the presiding Power, and which was to consist of all the German States except the Austrian. With this view a German Parliament was convoked at Erfurt, March 20th,

which was attended by representatives from such States as approved the Prussian views. But distrust and apprehension prevailed, and after a few sittings the new Parliament was indefinitely adjourned. The King of Würtemberg, on opening the Diet of his Kingdom, March 15th 1850, expressed himself so strongly against the projects of the Court of Berlin, that diplomatic relations were suspended between Würtemberg and Prussia. Frederick William IV. made another attempt to form a separate league by summoning a Congress at Berlin in May, which was attended by twenty-two German Princes, besides the representatives of Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck. At the same time, Austria had summoned the Diet of the Confederation to meet at Frankfort, which was attended by representatives from all the States except Prussia and Oldenburg. Thus two rival congresses were sitting at the same time; one at Berlin, to establish a new Confederation under Prussian influence; and one at Frankfort to maintain the old one, under the supremacy of Austria. The quarrel of the two leading German Powers was brought to an issue by some disturbances which occurred in Hesse-Cassel. Hassenpflug, the Elector's minister, treating the States with contempt, attempted to raise taxes without their consent. This arbitrary and unconstitutional act was opposed even by persons in the employ of the Government, and the Elector in alarm fled to Frankfort. Even a deputation from the officers of the army proceeded to Frankfort to protest against the illegal proceedings of Hassenpflug; to whom the Elector replied: "If you will not obey, take off your coats." Hereupon, between two and three hundred officers resigned their commissions. The seat of the Electoral Government was now established at Wilhelmsbad (September). The Diet at Frankfort resolved to support the Elector against his subjects, and Austria, Bavaria, and Würtemberg prepared to interfere in his favour; while Prussia took up the opposite side, and moved a large military force towards the Hessian frontier. A collision appeared inevitable, when hostilities were averted by Russian interference and a change of ministry at Berlin. To put an end to these disputes, conferences were opened at Dresden towards the end of December, which lasted till the middle of May 1851. In these debates, Prussia, under Russian influence, was induced to acknowledge the Frankfort Diet, in short, to withdraw all her novel pretensions; and the ancient state of things, after four years of revolution and disturbance, was re-established in the German Confederation. The Emperor of Austria now withdrew the Constitution which he had granted to his subjects, the definitive abolition of which was proclaimed January 1st 1852.

The affairs of Schleswig-Holstein had been again the occasion of anxiety and disturbance. A definitive peace between Denmark and the King of Prussia, in the name of the German Confederation, had been signed July 2nd 1850, by which the Duchies were relinquished to the Danes, but the rights of the German Bund in Holstein were maintained. The Duchies, however, renewed the war on their own account, but were finally reduced to submission to the King of Denmark by the intervention of the German Confederation. The affairs of Denmark were ultimately arranged, at the instance of the Emperor Nicholas, by the Treaty of London, May 8th 1852; to which were parties Austria, France, England, Prussia, Russia, and Sweden. By this treaty all the dominions then united under the sceptre of Denmark were to devolve to Prince Christian of Schleswig-Holstein Sonderburg Glücksburg, and upon his issue in the male line by his marriage with Louisa, Princess of Hesse. The principle of the integrity of the Danish monarchy was acknowledged by the contracting parties; but the rights of the German Confederation with regard to the Duchies of Holstein and Lauenburg were not to be affected by the treaty. The Duke of Augustenburg relinquished, on satisfaction, his claim to Schleswig and Holstein.

In Spain, after the ill-omened marriage of Isabella, the Government of the country seemed mainly to depend on her licentious amours. Weariness of Sarrano and a new passion for Colonel Gandara led to the overthrow of Salamanca's ministry, October 4th 1846, and the establishment of Narvaez and the *Moderados*. Narvaez compelled Isabella to observe at least external decency, and persuaded her again to admit King Francisco to the palace. Espartero returned to Spain early in 1848 and reconciled himself with Narvaez, but retired to a country life. Narvaez and the *Moderados* were in power at the time of Louis Philippe's fall, and were on a good understanding with the Queen-mother Christina, who had returned to Spain. The French Revolution of February 1848 was followed in Spain, as in other countries, by disturbances. The *Progressista*, or ultra democratic party, attempted an insurrection, March 23rd, and again, May 6th, but they were put down by the energy of the ministers. A suspicion that the English Government was concerned in these movements produced a temporary misunderstanding between Spain and Great Britain. After the fall of Louis Philippe, Lord Palmerston had instructed Sir H. Lytton Bulwer, the English ambassador at Madrid, to advise the Spanish Government to adopt "a legal and constitutional system." This interference was naturally resented by the Spaniards, and

after some correspondence, passports were forwarded to Sir H. L. Bulwer, May 19th, on the alleged ground that he had been privy to some plots against the Government. This quarrel was followed by a suspension of diplomatic correspondence between the two countries, which was not renewed till August 1850. A desultory guerilla warfare was also kept up throughout the year 1848 in the north of Spain by General Cabrera, the leader of the Carlists.

The continued success of Narvaez and the *Moderados* encouraged Queen Christina to project the restoration of absolutism. Narvaez was suddenly dismissed, October 18th 1849, and General Cleonard appointed in his place; a person, however, so wholly insignificant and incompetent, that it soon became necessary to restore Narvaez. Other more secret intrigues against that minister were baffled; but a piratical attempt by the Americans in 1850 to seize Cuba led to his downfall, by showing how necessary the friendship of England was to Spain. Narvaez was dismissed January 11th 1851, to the great grief of Isabella. Christina now ruled for some time with her new minister Bravo Murillo, but kept in the Constitutional path, till Napoleon's *coup d'état* in December 1852, and Isabella's delivery of a healthy daughter, which seemed to secure the succession, encouraged her mother to adopt some reactionary measures. These, however, served only to unite the *Moderados* and *Progressistas*; it became necessary to recall Narvaez; but in December 1853 Christina dismissed and banished him. The Queen-mother's thoughts were now bent on nothing but plundering the State for the benefit of her illegitimate children. Her conduct produced two or three unsuccessful revolts; but she was at length overthrown, and sent into Portugal (July 20th 1854). Espartero and the extreme *Progressistas* having now seized the reins of government, were in turn overthrown by an insurrection of the soldiery, conducted by O'Donnell, July 16th 1856; when Christina and Narvaez once more returned to power.

Portugal, under the reign of Donna Maria da Gloria, had also been agitated by two or three insurrections, which were, however, suppressed. Queen Maria died, in child-bed, in the prime of life, November 15th 1853, and was succeeded by her son, Don Pedro V. The new King being a minor, the Regency was assumed by his father, Ferdinand; but after spending some time in travelling, Pedro took the government into his own hands in 1855.

Meanwhile Rome continued to be occupied by the French, under the protection of whose bayonets Pius IX. returned to Rome in April 1850, and almost seemed to enjoy his former power. Under such guardianship attention to political matters was superfluous,

and the Pope's thoughts were diverted to the more congenial affairs of the Church. He employed himself in propagating Mariolatry, and in 1854 he caused a great assembly of bishops to establish the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception: a doctrine accepted by the Council of Basle in 1439, but not hitherto confirmed by the Pope. Pius IX. celebrated its establishment by crowning the image of the Virgin with a splendid diadem, December 8th 1854. The smouldering discontent in many other parts of Italy produced no events worth recording. The infamous oppressions of the Neapolitan Government caused the French and English Cabinets in 1856 to break off diplomatic relations with it. But the tyranny of the rulers of Italy was only preparing their own punishment.

In France, the Emperor Napoleon III. went on consolidating his power. The first great political event of his reign was the war which he waged, in conjunction with England, for the curbing of Muscovite ambition; with a brief sketch of which we shall conclude our narrative.

There was an ancient prophecy that in the year 1853, when four centuries would have elapsed from the taking of Constantinople, the Turkish Empire would be overthrown. Such prophecies sometimes work their own accomplishment, through the superstitious hopes and fears by which they either excite or depress those who are interested in them. The conjuncture, at all events, appeared to the Russian Emperor Nicholas a favourable one for attempting a long-cherished Muscovite project. The Turkish Empire seemed in a state of irretrievable prostration, and the Czar proposed to the British Government early in 1853 a partition of the "sick man's" spoils, by which Egypt, and, perhaps, Candia, was to fall to the share of England. The offer was, of course, rejected; it was then made to France with the like result, and the two Western nations united to oppose the designs of Nicholas.

Russia seized the opportunity of a dispute respecting the use and guardianship of the Holy Places at Jerusalem, and in Palestine, to pick a quarrel with the Porte. Nicholas, as protector of the Greek Christians in the Holy City, complained that the Porte had, contrary to treaty, allowed undue privileges to the Latin Christians, especially by granting them a key to the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem; while France, on the other hand, as protector of the Latin Christians, maintained that all that had been done was only in conformity with ancient usage and agreement. Under these circumstances, the Emperor Nicholas, after mustering the Russian fleet with great ostentation at Sebastopol, as well as an army of 30,000 men, despatched Prince Menschikoff

on a special embassy to Constantinople, to demand the exclusive protection of all members of the Greek Church in Turkey, and the settlement of the question respecting the Holy Places, on terms which would have left the supremacy to the Greeks. Menschikoff purposely delivered his message with marks of the greatest contempt, appearing in full Divan in his great coat and dirty boots (March 2nd 1853). Lord Stratford de Redcliffe and M. De la Cour, the English and French ambassadors, were unfortunately absent; but they returned in April, and on their assurance of vigorous support, the Sultan rejected the Russian demands. Menschikoff, after handing in an *ultimatum* that was disregarded, took his departure, May 21st, with the threat that he had come in his great coat, but would return in his uniform.

The Sultan published in June a *Firman*, confirming the Christians in his Empire in all their rights, and about the same time the English and French fleets, under Admirals Dundas and Hamelin, anchored near the entrance of the Dardanelles. Early in July, the Russian army under Prince Gortschakoff crossed the Pruth, and commenced a war which the Czar wished to appear as a war of religion. The Russians, divided into two corps of about 40,000 men each, commanded by Generals Dannenberg and Lüders, exercised under this holy pretence all manner of plunder and violence in Moldavia and Wallachia, the hospodars of which principalities fled into Austria. Meanwhile the Turkish army remained on the right bank of the Danube, and the Russians during the summer contented themselves with occupying the left. It was manifestly the interest of Austria that Russia should not be allowed to increase her power south of the Danube; yet she contented herself with joining Prussia in friendly representations to the Court of St. Petersburg, and both Powers would enter into no further engagements than to co-operate in endeavouring to maintain peace. The Court of Berlin, indeed, displayed as usual a base servility to the Russian autocrat. Nicholas had an interview with the Austrian Emperor Francis Joseph, at Olmütz, September 24th; whence he proceeded to Berlin, on a visit to his brother-in-law, Frederick William IV. He wished to form with these Sovereigns a triple alliance against the Western Powers, but succeeded only in obtaining their neutrality; and he engaged that his troops should not cross the Danube.

But a declaration of war by the Porte, October 4th, in case the Russians refused to evacuate the principalities, afforded Nicholas the wished-for opportunity to proclaim himself the party attacked. He did not, however, push the war with a vigour at all proportioned

to his boastful threats. The first trial of strength was in favour of the Turks. Omar Pasha, having sent 3000 men over the Danube, this small corps, having entrenched itself at Olteniza, repulsed the attacks of 7000 Russians (November 4th 1853). On the 27th of the same month, France and England concluded a treaty with the Porte, promising their aid in case Russia would not agree to moderate conditions of peace. But an event which occurred a few days after entirely dissipated all such hopes. Admiral Nachimoff, the Russian commander in the Black Sea, taking advantage of a fog, attacked and destroyed the Turkish fleet under Osman Pasha, while lying at Sinope, not, however, without considerable damage to his own vessels, November 30th. As the English and French fleets had passed the Dardanelles in September, and were now at anchor in the Bosphorus, the act of Nachimoff appeared a wilful defiance of the Maritime Powers. This event excited feelings of great indignation in England; and, as was natural, still more so at Constantinople. It was now evident that the attempts of the Conference, which the four great neutral Powers, Austria, France, Great Britain, and Prussia, had assembled in the summer at Vienna, to maintain peace, would be abortive; and, indeed, their proposals were rejected both by Russia and the Porte; by the latter, chiefly because of an article requiring a renewal of the ancient treaties between Turkey and Russia. The Emperor of the French, in the hope of preserving peace, addressed an autograph letter to the Emperor Nicholas, January 29th 1854. Contrary to expectation, Nicholas replied at length, and though sophistically, with politeness. The last resource had now failed. In February, diplomatic relations were broken off between Russia and the Western Powers; the latter declared war against the Czar, and concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with Turkey, March 12th. Austria contented herself with placing a corps of observation on the Servian frontiers; while Prussia, though recognising the injustice of the Russian proceedings, declined to oppose them.

Towards the close of 1853, the Russians, under General Anrep, 50,000 strong, had attacked Kalafat, which forms a fortified *tête de pont* to Widdin, in the hope of penetrating into Servia; but they were repulsed, and suffered severe loss from the climate at that season. The Russians renewed the attempt, January 6th 1854, but were again defeated at Cetate; after which they withdrew from this quarter, on account of the Austrian army of observation. The plan to make their way to Constantinople by an insurrection of the Slavonians, Servians, Bosnians, and Bulgarians,

was thus frustrated. Some of the Greeks rose, but only to commit robbery and murder; and the Court of Athens was too fearful of the Western Powers to venture on any movement.

Prince Paskiewitsch was now appointed commander-in-chief of the Russian army, and the attack was transferred from the right wing to the left. A division crossed the Danube near Silistria, another lower down, near the Pruth, and having formed a junction, advanced to attack Omar Pasha, who retired to Shumla (March 1854). With a view to draw him from this position, Paskiewitsch caused Silistria to be besieged. But Omar was too wary to fall into the trap; all the Russian assaults were repulsed, Paskiewitsch himself was wounded, and on June 21st he abandoned the siege, recrossed the Danube, and even the Pruth. The last step was taken in consequence of the attitude assumed by Austria and Prussia. Those two Powers had entered into an offensive and defensive alliance, April 20th, by which they agreed to declare war against Russia if her troops should pass the Balkan, or if she should attempt to incorporate the principalities. An Austrian note, backed by Prussia, and addressed in June to the Cabinet of St. Petersburg, had required the evacuation of Wallachia and Moldavia; and those principalities, by virtue of a convention with the Porte, were now occupied by the Austrians.

Meanwhile France and England were beginning to take part in the war. The allied fleets had attacked Odessa, April 22nd, and burnt a number of ships and houses, but abstained from bombarding the town. The English army under Lord Raglan, under whom served the Duke of Cambridge and other officers of distinction, had landed at Gallipoli, April 5th, where they found a portion of the French army already disembarked. Hence the allies proceeded to Varna, with the design of penetrating into the Dobrudscha; but the nature of the country and the fearful mortality among the troops, from the climate and cholera, caused the enterprise to be abandoned. To penetrate into the heart of Russia appeared impossible, and it was therefore resolved to attempt the capture of Sebastopol. The allied armies, in spite of their losses, still numbered about 50,000 men; and embarking with about 6000 Turks, they landed without opposition near Eupatoria, in the Crimea, September 14th 1854. Nachimoff, the victor of Sinope, though he had fifty-four Russian ships at Sebastopol, ventured not to come out and attack the allied armament. The forces of Prince Menschikoff, who commanded in the Crimea, were inferior to those of the allies; but he had taken up a position on the river Alma which he deemed impregnable, and in his overweening confidence he had invited a

party of ladies from Sebastopol to come and behold the destruction of the enemy. But the position was carried by the indomitable courage of the allies, September 20th; not, however, without great loss, the British suffering most severely, from having to assault the position in front; while the French, under Marshal St. Arnaud, turned the enemy's left wing. The allied loss amounted to 3479 men, of which nearly three-fifths belonged to the British, although their troops were not near so numerous as the French. The Russian loss was estimated at about 8000 men.

A necessary delay to bury the dead and provide for the sick and wounded deprived the allies of the opportunity to penetrate along with the enemy into Sebastopol. It was not judged practicable to take it by assault, though this might perhaps have been accomplished had it been immediately undertaken, and a siege in regular form became therefore necessary. Marshal St. Arnaud was compelled by the state of his health to resign the command to General Canrobert soon after the battle of the Alma. He died in his passage to Constantinople. The English army now took up a position at the Bay of Balaclava, the French at that of Kamiesch, and began to open trenches on the plateau on the south side of Sebastopol. The allies opened their fire on the town, October 17th. Sebastopol was also bombarded by the fleets, which, however, suffered so severely that they were compelled to desist. The Russians attacked the English position at Balaclava, October 25th, but were repulsed; a battle rendered memorable by the gallant but rash and fatal charge of the British cavalry, when, by some mistake in the delivery of orders, nearly two-thirds of the light brigade were uselessly sacrificed. This battle was soon followed by that of Inkermann, Nov. 5th, when the Russians, with very superior forces, and in the presence of the Grand Dukes Nicholas and Michael, again attacked the British position, and were once more repulsed with dreadful loss. The British were most gallantly supported by their French allies. During this campaign, Admiral Napier, with the British fleet, accompanied by a French squadron, proceeded into the Baltic, where, however, little was effected. Cronstadt was found too strong to be attacked; the Russian fleet kept in port, and the British admiral was forced to content himself with capturing some merchant vessels, and burning timber and other stores. Some English ships also penetrated into the White Sea, blockaded Archangel, and destroyed the port of Kola. A detachment of French troops under General Baraguay d'Hilliers captured Bomarsund in the Aland Isles, August 15th; after which exploit the allied fleet quitted the Baltic.

Austria concluded an offensive and defensive alliance with the

two Western Powers, December 2nd 1854, but lent them no assistance. Russia pretended to enter into negociations for a peace at Vienna, only with a view to gain time, and if possible to separate the allies. A more active and gallant ally than Austria, though without the same interest in the dispute, was the King of Sardinia; who, in January 1855, joined the Western Powers and sent an army of 15,000 men, under General Marmora, into the Crimea. The allied armies had passed a most dreadful winter in their encampments. The British soldiers especially died by hundreds of cold, disease, and privation, while the clothing, stores, and medicines, which might have averted these calamities, were, through the almost incredible bungling and mismanagement of the commissariat department, lying unpacked at Balaclava. The just and violent indignation felt in England at this state of things produced the fall of the Aberdeen Ministry in February 1855. Lord Aberdeen was succeeded as prime minister by Lord Palmerston.

The Russians made an ineffectual attempt on Eupatoria, February 16th. The sudden and unexpected death of the Emperor Nicholas, March 2nd, seemed to open a prospect for peace. His successor, Alexander II., was more pacifically disposed than his father, and the conferences at Vienna were re-opened. The recall of Prince Menschikoff from the Crimea, who was succeeded by Prince Gortschakoff, seemed also a concession to public opinion. The reduction of Sebastopol appeared, however, to the allies, and especially to Napoleon III., to be a necessary satisfaction for military honour. The bombardment of Sebastopol was, after a long preparation, reopened by the allies, April 6th 1855; but the fire of the place still proved superior. A naval expedition under Admirals Lyons and Bruat, proceeded to the Sea of Asof, took Kertsch, Jenikale, Mariapol, Taganrog, and other places, and destroyed vast quantities of provisions and stores which served to supply Sebastopol. A grand assault delivered by the allies on that city, June 18th, was repulsed with great loss to the assailants. A change in the command of both the allied armies took place about this time. By the death of Lord Raglan, June 28th, General Simpson succeeded to the command of the English force, while the French General Canrobert had resigned a little previously in favour of Pelissier. Austria this month virtually withdrew from an alliance which she had never materially assisted, and by discharging great part of her troops, enabled Russia to despatch to the Crimea several regiments which she had been obliged to keep in Poland.

In the Baltic, Admiral Dundas, who had been substituted for

Napier, found himself unable to effect more than had been accomplished by his predecessor the year before. His operations were confined to the burning of a few Russian harbours and an ineffectual attempt to bombard Sveaborg. But under their reverses the allied Powers drew still closer the *entente cordiale*. Napoleon with his consort had visited London in the spring, and in August his visit was returned by Queen Victoria. A meeting of both the Sovereigns at the tomb of Napoleon the First seemed calculated to obliterate for ever any remains of national animosity.

The valour and perseverance of the allies were at length to triumph over all difficulties. An attack on the allied position by the Russians from the Tschernaja was repulsed with great loss, August 16th, and on the following day a terrible bombardment of Sebastopol was commenced. By September 8th, the fortifications had been reduced almost to a heap of rubbish, and it was determined to assault the place. The French succeeded in capturing the Malakof Tower, while the British penetrated into the Redan, but were unable to hold it. The south side of Sebastopol was, however, no longer tenable after the capture of the Malakof; and in the night Prince Gortschakoff evacuated it, passing over the arm of the sea which separates it from the north side by means of a bridge of boats. Previously to their departure the Russians sunk all their ships in the harbour with the exception of a steamer. The success of the allies was not, however, decisive. They made one or two ineffectual sorties against Gortschakoff's new position; and even should they succeed in driving him thence, the Crimea still remained to be conquered. With the view of effecting that conquest, the fleets had undertaken a second expedition to the sea of Asof, where they destroyed the small fortresses of Fanagoria and Taman, as well as another against Kinburn in the north-west of the Crimea, which was captured after a short bombardment. But it was found impossible to take Perekop, and thus, by obtaining command of the Isthmus, compel Gortschakoff to retreat.

During this period a war had been also raging between the Turks and Russians in the Trans-Caucasian provinces, which our limits permit us not to describe. This year the remains of the Turkish army in this quarter were dispersed by the Russian general Muravief. The English general Williams distinguished himself by the defence of Kars, repulsing repeated assaults of the Russians; but famine at length compelled him to surrender the city, Nov. 7th 1855.

The capture of Kars seemed a compensation to Russian military honour for the loss of Sebastopol, and facilitated the

opening of negociations for a peace. Austria now intervened; Prince Esterhazy was despatched to St. Petersburg, and on January 16th 1856 signed with Count Nesselrode a protocol containing the bases of negociation. These were: the abolition of the Russian protectorate in the Danubian principalities, the freedom of the Danube and its mouths, the neutralisation of the Black Sea, which was to be open to the commerce of all nations, but closed to ships of war; no military or naval arsenals to be maintained there: the immunities of the Rayah, or Christian, subjects of the Porte to be preserved. In order to deprive Russia of any pretence for interference with regard to this last point, the Porte accepted ten days later twenty-one propositions with regard to it made by the Western Powers and Austria, which included reforms of the tribunals, police, mode of taxation, &c. After the arrangement of these matters, Conferences for a peace were opened at Paris, February 26th, when an armistice was agreed upon to last till March 31st. The Conference consisted of the representatives of Great Britain, Austria, France, Russia, Sardinia, and Turkey. Prussia, having taken no part in the war, was at first excluded from the Congress, but, by persevering importunity, obtained admission, March 11th. A definitive peace was signed on the conditions before mentioned, March 30th. Russia engaged to restore Kars to the Porte, and the Allied Powers to evacuate Sebastopol and all their other conquests in the Crimea. The integrity of the Turkish Empire was guaranteed. The Emperor of Russia and the Sultan agreed not to erect or maintain any military arsenal on the coasts of the Black Sea, and to keep only such a number of ships of war in that sea, for the maintenance of the necessary police, as might be agreed on between the two Powers. The Danube was declared unconditionally free, and a European Commission was appointed to superintend its navigation and police.

The line of the Russian and Turkish frontier was left to be arranged by delegates of the contracting Powers, and was finally determined by the Treaty of Paris, concluded between those Powers, June 19th 1857. The line in Bessarabia was laid down according to a topographical map prepared for the purpose. The islands forming the Delta of the Danube, including the Isle of Serpents, were now restored to the sovereignty of the Porte.

INDEX.

INDEX.

ABASSID, caliphate transferred, i. 3
Abdallah el Zagul, i. 191
Abd-el-Kader, iv. 612
Abdul Hamed, Sultan, iii. 469; death, 496
Abdul Medschid, Sultan, iv. 610
Abercrombie, Sir Ralph, iv. 326, 354
Aberdeen, Lord, iv. 542, 661
Abo, Congress of, iii. 365; treaty, 366
Academy, Roman, i. 105; French, iii. 259
Acadia, or Nova Scotia, iii. 393
Achmet Aga, iv. 504
— I., Sultan, ii. 387; death, 503
— II., Sultan, iii. 114
— III., Sultan, declares war against Russia, iii. 213; war with Venice, 301; abdicates, 331
Acre, siege of, iv. 329
'Act of Abjuration' (Dutch), ii. 310
Acton, Neapolitan minister, iv. 206, 311 sq.
Addington, H., Premier, iv. 355, 370; resigns, 384
Adolphus Frederick (of Holstein-Gottorp), iii. 365; elected to Swedish succession, 366; accession, 405; peace with Prussia, 433; death, 488
— of Guelderland, i. 141, 154
Adorni and Fregosi, factions, i. 45
Adorno, Ant., Doge of Genoa, i. 488
—, Prosper, i. 109
Adretz, Baron des, ii. 163
Adrian of Utrecht, Regent of Castile, i. 364, 378; revolt against his authority, 403; elected Pope, 420. (*See* Adrian I.)
— I., Pope, i. 420; arrives in Rome, 424; unpopularity, 425; death, 439
Adrianople, Peace of, iv. 585
Æneas Sylvius, i. 81, 84; becomes Pope Pius, ii. 92
Aerschot, Duke of, ii. 300, 304
Affre, M., Archbishop of Paris, iv. 626
Africa, ancient circumnavigation of, i. 315
Aga of the Janissaries, i. 7
Agnes, Countess of Mansfeld, ii. 379
Agucsseau, d', chancellor, iv. 19
Aiguillon, d', Duke, iii. 468, 508 sqq.
Ailly, Peter d', i. 329
Aix-la-Chapelle, Congress (1748), iii. 389; (1818), iv. 564; Peace, iii. 79, 390
Akierman, treaty of, iv. 583
Akindshi, what, i. 5
Alaeddin, Sultan of Iconium, i. 2
— vizier, i. 3
Albany, Duke of, 444 sq., 466
Alberoni, Cardinal, iii. 251, 293 sq., 300 sqq.; 331
Albert, iv. 624 sq.
— Achilles of Brandenburg, i. 144
—, Archduke, governor of the Netherlands, ii. 369; invades France, 370; captures Amiens, 372; marries the Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia, 433
— of Brandenburg, i. 511; seizes the possessions of the Teutonic Order, 512, 607; marauding expedition of, ii. 98; joins Charles V., 101
— of Culmbach, ii. 44
— II., Emperor, defeated by the Turks, i. 15, 32
— V., Duke of Bavaria, ii. 395
Albret, John d', marries Catherine of Navarre, i. 294; endeavours to recover his kingdom, 364; death, *ib.*
—, Jeanne d', i. 577, 591
Albuquerque, Alphonso, i. 323
—, Don Matthias, ii. 629
Alcantara, order of, i. 60
Alcavala, the, ii. 251
Alchemy, i. 340
Alcudia, Duke of. (*See* Godoy.)
Aldegonde, Ste., ii. 234; his songs and publications, 252; at Worms, 305; at Antwerp, 318
Aldobrandino, ii. 205. (*See* Clement VIII.)
Aldus Manutius, ii. 21
Aleander, i. 400
Alembert, D', iv. 22
Alençon, Duke of, ii. 204; joins the Hugonots, 276; assumes the title of Anjou, 278; elected governor of Netherlands, 303, 309; defeats Farnese, 312; proceeds to England, *ib.*; Duke of Brabant, *ib.*; seizes several towns, 314; death, 316
Alexander I., Czar, iv. 351; treaty with Great Britain, *ib.*; peace with France and Spain, 352; interview with the King of Prussia at Memel, 363; offers to mediate between France and England, 375; remonstrates with Napoleon, 381; erects a monument to the Duke d'Enghien, 382; courts Frederick William III., 385; treaty with England, 388; at Potsdam, 402; at the tomb of Frederick II., 403; retreats after Austerlitz, 406; interview with Napoleon at Tilsit, 431; secret arrangements, 434; rupture with Great Britain, 442; war with Sweden, 446; interview with Napoleon at Erfurt, 475; their letter to George III., 476; recognises Joseph Bonaparte in Spain, *ib.*; growing hatred of Napoleon, 502; renounces the Continental System, 503; war with Turkey, *ib.* sq.; agrees to annex Norway to Sweden, 508; opens the Russian ports, *ib.*; alliance with Prussia, 525; conciliates the Poles, 528; at Gross Görschen, 530; at Leipsic, 535; enters Paris, 544; compels Louis XVIII. to grant a charter, 547; visits London, 548; imagines the Holy Alliance, 563; death, 583
Alexander II., Czar, iv. 661
— VI., Pope, i. 177; prohibits Savonarola the pulpit, 220, 222; extends indulgences to the dead, 223; sales of the Cardinalate, 238; death, *ib.*; his bull of *demarcation*, 320
— VII., Pope, humbled by Louis XIV., iii. 70
— VIII., Pope, iii. 154; anti-French policy, *ib.*; death, 159
Alexandra, Grand Duchess, iv. 629
Alexis, son of Peter the Great, iii. 327; death, 328
— Czar, iii. 41; reunites the Ukraine, 43; his vast pretensions, 51; imprisons the Swedish ambassadors, *ib.*; invades the Swedish dominions, 51; peace with the Poles, 65; death, 111, *note*.
Algiers, reduced by Louis XIV., iii. 133; expedition to, iv. 578
Alhambra, the, i. 189.
Alibaud, iv. 605
Ali, Pasha of Janina, iv. 310, 581
Alkmaar, Capitulation of, iv. 327
Allen, Dr. Wm., ii. 289; made a cardinal, 326, 397
Alliance, Grand, iii. 154; renewed, 161; Second, 168; dissolved, 207; Holy, iv. 563; interferes in Spain, 569; of Hanover, iii. 311, 351; Quadruple (1718), 304; (1745), 378; Triple (1668), 78; (1717), 300; of Vienna, 310
Alphonso the Wise, i. 53, 53; pri.

ALPHONSO

soner at Milan, 54; obtains Naples, 55; attacks Genoa, 99; death and character, *ib.*
Alphonso II., King of Naples, i. 203; abdicates in favour of his son, 211
— Duke of Calabria, i. 110; marches against the Turks, 111
— Duke of Ferrara, i. 275, 291, 488
— V. of Portugal, marries his niece Joanna, heiress of Castile, i. 186; defeated by Ferdinand of Aragon, *ib.*; renounces his pretensions to Castile, 187; death, *ib.*
— VI. of Portugal, iii. 66; attacked by the Dutch, 67; alliance with England, *ib.*; his profligate character, 68; abdication and death, *ib.*
Altmark, truce of, ii. 521
Altranstädt, Peace of, iii. 234
Altringer, General, ii. 577, 585
Alva, Duke of, ii. 40, 51, 109, 119, 121, 176, 179, 198, 230, 241, 242; arrests Egmont and Horn, 243; governor of the Netherlands, 245; reign of terror, *ib.*; cruelty, 249, 254, 255; superseded, 257; cruelty in Portugal, 288
Alvinzi, General, iv. 218 sqq., 254 sq.
Amadæus VIII. of Savoy, becomes pope (Felix V.), i. 331
Amarante, Count, iv. 572
Ambassadors, i. 308; Venetian, 309
Amboise, d', Cardinal, i. 223, 236 sqq.; death, 272
— conspiracy of, ii. 141
Amelia Elizabeth, Landgravine of Hesse-Cassel, ii. 608
America, when first known, i. 315; discovered by Columbus, 319; revolt of, iii. 522; declaration of independence, 523; Spanish, insurrection in, iv. 566
Amerigo Vespucci, i. 321
Amiens, treaty of, i. 487; Peace of, iv. 356
Amsterdam, rise of, ii. 23; treaty of, iii. 250
Amurath II., Sultan, i. 14; wars with the Hungarians, 15, 19; in Peloponnesus, *ib.* 20
— III., Sultan, offers to support Henry IV., ii. 349; favours English commerce, 382; declares war against the Emperor, 384; death, 385; his avarice, 424
— IV., Sultan, ii. 505; cruelty, 620; revolt of Janissaries, *ib.*; captures Bagdad, *ib.*; death, *ib.*
Amyot, Jacques, ii. 85
Anabaptists, i. 510, 567
Anastro, ii. 313
Ancenis, treaty of, i. 128
Ancients, geography of the, i. 314
Ancre, d', Marshal, ii. 465 sqq.; assassinated, 472
Andelot, D', ii. 122, 126
Andréossy, General, iv. 330
Angelo, St., Castle, fortified, i. 239
Anglomania, iv. 19
Angoulême, Duke of, iv. 546, 569
— Duchess of, daughter of Louis XVI., exchanged against Camus and others, iv. 226; returns to Paris, 547; in South of France, 553
Anilleros, iv. 568
Anjou, house of, pretensions to Naples, i. 52
— Duke of, proposed marriage with Elizabeth, ii. 199; character, 201
— — —, elected to Polish crown, 271; becomes King of France 274. (*See* Henry III.)
Ankarström, Captain, iv. 199 sq.

ANNA

Anna Ivanovna, Empress, iii. 316 sq., 330, 351, sqq.
Anna Petrowna, iii. 254, 328
Anne of Austria, marries Louis XIII., ii. 466; inhumanity of, 473; levity, 531; plot against Richelieu, 538; bears a son, 598; becomes Regent, 614; concedes the demands of the Parliament, iii. 6; views of a Spanish match, 31; interview with Philip IV., 34; death, 75
Anne of Brittany, treaty with Henry VII., i. 167; marriage with Maximilian king of the Romans, *ib.*; annulled, 169; marries Charles VIII., 170
Anne, daughter of Louis XI., Regent, i. 160; procures transfer of Brittany to Charles VIII., 163; coalition against her, 165
Anne, Queen, iii. 179; peace with France, 204; death, 209
Annebout, Admiral, i. 598 sq., 616
Anson, Commodore, iii. 338, 388, 417
Anthony of Navarre, favours the Protestants, ii. 136; repulsed from the Regency, 139; appears at Orleans, 148; abandons the Regency to Catherine de' Medici, 149; deserts the Protestant cause, 156, 158; death, 164
— King of Saxony, iv. 602
— of Vaudemont, i. 145
— Ulric of Brunswick, iii. 352, 364
Antipope, i. 327
Antonio, Prior of Crato, ii. 287, 290 sq., 329
Apafy, Michael, iii. 104, 107, 111, 114
Apraxin, Marshal, iii. 411 sq.
Aqua Felice, ii. 325
Arago, iv. 623, 625
Aragon, house of, claims to Naples, i. 52 sq.
— Kingdom of, i. 56, 58; constitution, 59; liberties suppressed, ii. 333
Aranda, Count d', iii. 516, 540; iv. 87
Arbuthnot, Sir C., iv. 445
Archers, English, i. 305
Arcimboldi, I. 385
Argenson, d', Marquis, iii. 383; iv. 13, 34
Arianites, i. 19
Ariosto, i. 286
Armada, Spanish, ii. 329
Armagnacs, i. 63
Armies, standing, i. 307
"Armies of the Faith," iv. 568
Arminians, ii. 478
Arminius, ii. 477
Arnaud, Angelica, ii. 287
— Antony, iii. 288
Arnim, Colonel, ii. 551 sqq., 578, 585
— Heinrich von, iv. 632
Arnold, Duke of Guelderland, i. 141
Arran, Regent, ii. 77
Arras, treaty of, i. 66; Peace, 158
Artevelde, Van, i. 584
Artois, d', Count, iii. 543; iv. 37, 46, 52, 74, 86, 228; lieutenant-general, 546; signs a convention with the allies, *ib.*; bigotry, 564; becomes King of France, 578. (*See* Charles X.)
Asiento, iii. 176, 206, 281, 336 sq.
Assassination, organised by the Jesuits, ii. 396
Assemblies, French. (*See* Revolution.)

BAGLIONI

Assignats, origin of, iv. 68; decline of, 211
Asturias, Prince of, origin of that title, i. 219, *note.*
Athens, Duchy of, its history, i. 78
— bombarded by the Venetians, iii. 112
Atmeidan, the, i. 12
Auersberg, iii. 83 sq
Auersperg, Prince, iv. 401
Augereau, Marshal, iv. 240 sqq; 273 sqq; 375, 423
Augsburg, Diet of, i. 536; Confession of, 538; Recess, 541; Diet of, ii. 66; Charles V.'s proceedings at, 71; (1550), 81, 83; (1555), 112
Augustinians of Meissen, their reforms, i. 498
Augustus, Elector of Saxony, ii. 101, 452
— of Saxony, surnamed "the Strong," iii. 114; turns Catholic, 115; crowned King of Poland, *ib.* (*See* Augustus II.)
— II. of Poland, iii. 115; design against Sweden, 213; interview with the Czar Peter, 218; duplicity, 220; invades Livonia, *ib.*; treaty with the Czar, 225; defeated by Charles XII. at Clissow, 228; deposed, 230; seizes James Sobieski, *ib.*; takes and loses Warsaw, 231; interview with the Czar at Grodno, 232; renounces the Polish crown, 234; delivers up Patkul, *ib.*; interview with Charles XII., 235; resumes the crown, 241; renews his alliance with the Czar, *ib.*; treaty with the Porte, 246; perpetual peace of Warsaw, 248; treaty with Sweden, 253; death, 316
— III. of Poland, iii. 319; recognised, 321; treaty with Polish States, 325; policy in the Austrian succession, 350; invades Austria, 352; reconciled with Austria, 358; aids Maria Theresa, 376; joins the Quadruple Alliance; 378; flies to Prague, 381; peace with Prussia, *ib.*; at Königstein, 404; retires into Poland, *ib.*; Peace of Hubertsburg, 439 sq.; death, 448
Aulic Council, what, ii. 449, *note.*
Aumale, d', Duke, iv. 624
Aurora von Königsmark, iii. 227, 230, 373
Austria, made an arch-duchy, i. 29; geographical divisions, ii. 447, *note.*
— Rivalry with France, i. 414; iii. 267; position in Europe, 268; origin of Empire, iv. 383
Austrian Succession, claimants, iii. 348; termination and results of the war, 391
Austrian Committee, iv. 89
Autos da fé, ii. 399
Avaux, d', ii. 622; iii. 143 sqq.
Aveiro, Duke of, iii. 436
Avignon, Papal Court removed to, i. 326; annexed to France, iv. 82; massacres at, 83
Ayala, Balthazar, iii. 271
Azab, the, what, i. 6
Azara, iii. 476; iv. 246, 356

BABŒUF, Caius Gracchus, iv. 257
Bacciocchi, Felix, iv. 342
Bacon, Roger, i. 302, 314
Baden Resolutions, iv. 631
Baglioni, Gian Paolo, i. 409

BAGRATION
Bagration, Prince, iv. 399 sq.; 503 sq.
Bailly, iv. 45, 50 sq., 60, 78 sq., 153
Baird, Sir David, iv. 354, 478
Baireuth, Margravine of, iii. 415
Bajazet II., Sultan, i. 244; attacks the Venetians, 245; dethroned, 369; death, *ib.*
Balagui, governor of Cambral, ii. 369
Balboa, discovers the Pacific, i. 323
Ballasteros, General, iv. 506, 568 sq.
Baltic, neutrality of, iii. 421
Baltimore, Lord, iii. 278
Balue, Cardinal de la, i. 131
Baner, General, ii. 367 sqq., 585, 590 sqq., 600, 609
Bar, Confederation of, iii. 456
Baraguay d'Hilliers, General, iv. 263 sqq., 519
Baratinski, Prince, iv. 197
Barbara Von Cilly, i. 32
Barbarossa, i. 549, 559, 574, 582, 608 sq.
Barbaroux, iv. 94, 98, 100, 116, 142, 153
Barbé Marbois, iv. 271 sqq.
Barberini, Cardinal, ii. 535
Barcelona, treaty of, i. 491; commerce of, ii. 18; maritime laws of, 27; decline of its trade, ii. 408
Barclay de Tolly, iv. 513 sqq., 532
Barcsai, iii. 104
Barère, iv. 65, 116, 122, 136, 141, 147, 149, 150, 171, 172, 210, 211, 212, 216, 218
Barillon, iii. 4
Barlaimont, Count, ii. 225, 231, 244
Barnabites, founded, ii. 9
Barnave, iv. 73 sqq., 80, 106, 153
Barras, iv. 158, 175, 212 sq., 230 sqq., 243, 271 sqq., 283 sqq., 298 sqq., 315, 322, 331 sq.
Barri, Countess de, iii. 508, 519, 521, 541; iv. 153
Barricades, Day of the, ii. 338
Barrier treaty, iii. 203, 208
Barrot, Odillon, iv. 590 sqq., 608, 622 sqq.
Bart, Jean, iii. 156, 160
Bartenstein, Convention of, iv. 430
Barthélemy, iv. 271, 274
Bartholomew, St., massacre, whether planned at Bayonne, ii. 176; account of, 209 sqq.; whether premeditated, 212 sqq.; avowed by Charles IX., 267
Basle, Council of, i. 331; Peace of, iv. 221; treaty of, between France and Spain, 1795, 227
Basnage, iii. 141
Bassano, Duke of, iv. 510, 515, 525
Basseville, murder of, iv. 123
Bassompierre, Marshal, ii. 536, 540
Bastille, captured, iv. 50
Batavian Republic, iv. 220, 316; altered, 368; converted into a kingdom, 414
Bathori, Gabriel, ii. 491
Bathori, Sigismund, governor of Transylvania, ii. 381, 384 sqq.
Bathori, Stephen, i. 98
Bathori, Stephen, ii. 265; elected King of Poland, *ib.* 277; death, 380
Batthyani, Count, iv. 637, 644
Battles and Sieges:
Abensberg, iv. 481; Aboukir, or Nile, 304; Aboukir, 354; Aguadello, i. 266; Albuhera, iv. 499; Alcantara, ii. 288; Aljubarota, i. 62; Alkmaar, ii. 256; Alma, iv. 660; Almanza, iii. 193; Almeida, iv. 499; Almenara, iii. 198; Antwerp, ii. 239; do. (siege 1585), 318; do. (1832), iv. 599; Arcole, 254; Aspern, 484; Asunden Lake, ii. 509; Auerstädt, 424;
BATTLES
Austerlitz, iv. 504; Badajoz, 500; Balaclava, 660; Barcelona, iii. 189, 204; Barkan, 106; Barnet, i. 136; Bautzen, iv. 531; Bassano, 254; Baylen, 473; Bayonne, 540; Beachy Head, iii. 152; Belchite, iv. 497; Belgrade, i. 86; Bergen, iii. 419; Bicocca, i. 420; Bléneau, iii. 13; Blenheim, 185; Bochetta, i. 109; Borodino, iv. 516; Bosworth, i. 163; Boyne, iii. 152; Brankirka, ii. 508; Breda, 330, 545; Brescia, i. 287; Brienne, or La Rothière, iv. 543; Brotfeld, i. 98; Brunkeberg, ii. 507; Buda, iii. 111; Burkersdorf, 434; Cadiz, ii. 371; Caffa, i. 98; Caldiero, iv. 401; Camperdown, 284; Caudia, ii. 621; iii. 107; Caravaggio, i. 51; Castiglione, iv. 253; Cerignola, i 237; Cerisola, 607; Chebreisse, iv. 303; Chesmeh, iii. 461; Ciudad Rodrigo, iv. 499 sq.; Corunna, 478; Cossova, i. 18; Coutras, ii. 336; Czaslau, iii. 357; Denain, 203; Dennewitz, iv. 536; Dettingen, iii. 370; Dormans, ii. 277; Dresden, iv. 534; Dreux, ii. 165; Dunes, iii. 26; Ebersberg, iv. 482; Eckmühl, 482; Elchingen, 399; Entzheim, iii. 97; Espinosa, 477; Essling, 484; Eylau, 429; Fehrbellin, iii. 23; Fleurus, iii. 155; iv. 217; Flodden, i. 345; Fontaine Française, ii. 363; Fontenoy, iii. 382; Fornovo, i. 216; Friedland, iv. 430; Fuentes de Onoro, 499; Gadabusch, iii. 242; Gaëté, iv. 639; Gamonal, 477; Garigliano, i. 243; Gibraltar, iii. 537; Granson, i. 148; Gross Beeren, iv. 534; Gross Görschen, 530; Gross Jägerndorf, iii. 411; Guenez, iv. 477; Guinegate, i. 156; Güns, i. 551; Haarlem, ii. 256; Heliopolis, iv. 354; Hertzogenbusch, ii. 587; Hesdin i. 422; Heyligerlee, 247; Hochkirch, iii. 418; Höchst, ii. 501; Hochstädt, iii. 183; iv. 338; Hohenlinden, 339; Hollabrünn, 401, 485; Inkermann, 660; Isly, 612; Ismail, iii. 505; iv. 503; Ivry, ii. 349; Jankowitz, 619; Jarnac, i. 182; Jemappes, iv. 116; Jena, 424; Kaleb Medina, 610; Kalisch, iii. 235; Kappel, i. 402, 545; Katzbach, iv. 534; Kesselsdorf, iii. 381; Klausenburg, 104; Kolin, 411; Krasnoi, iv. 516; Krefeld, iii. 416; Kulm, iv. 535; Kunersdorf, iii. 420; Lagos Bay, 158; La Hogue, 156; Lanscrona, 125; Laon, iv. 543; Lauffen, i. 569; Lawfeld, iii. 388; Leipsic (1631), ii. 565; (1642), 611; (1813), iv. 535; Lens, ii. 635; Lepanto, 195; Leuthen, iii. 413; Leyden, ii. 259 sq.; Liakhovo, iv. 519; Liegnitz, ii. 585; Liesna, iii. 238; Ligny, iv. 556; Lipan, i. 32; Loano, iv. 235; Lodi, 243; Longwy, 107; Lowestoff, iii. 73; Lucignano, ii. 108; Lunden, iii. 124; Lutter, ii. 551; Lützen, 573; Maciéwice, iv. 194; Madonna dell' Olmo, iii. 373; Maestricht, ii. 306; Magdeburg, ii. 86, 564; Magnano, iv. 320; Maida, iv. 412; Malplaquet, iii. 196; Malta, ii. 189 sq.; Mantua, iv. 235; Marchfeld, 484; Marengo, 337; Marignano, i. 355; Marsaglia, iii. 158; Medellin, iv. 496; Millesimo, 241; Minden, iii. 419; Mingolsheim, ii. 500; Möckern, iv. 529; Mohacs (1526),
BAYANNE
i. 520; (1685), iii. 111; Mollwitz, 347; Molinella, la, i. 404; Moncontour, 183; Mons, iii. 102; Montenotte, iv, 240; Montereau, 543; Montlhéry, i. 123; Mook Heath, ii. 259; Morat, i. 149; Morgarten, i. 30; Möskirch, iv. 338; Mühlberg, ii. 45; Murviedro, iv. 500; Naefels, i. 30; Narva, iii. 224; Navarino, iv. 585; Negropont, i. 96; Neerwinden, iii. 158; Neresheim, iv. 251; Neumarkt, 264; Nisib, 610; Nivelle, the, 540; Neuss, i. 143; Nollendorf, iv. 535; Nördlingen, ii. 585; North Foreland, iii. 73; Ocaña, iv. 497; Olteniza, 658; Orthez, 546; Ostend, ii. 434, 437; Ostrowno, iv. 515; Otranto, i. 111; Oudenarde, iii. 195; Pampeluna, iv. 540; Pavia, i. 445; Perpignan, 599; Petronell, iii. 108; Pfaffendorp, iii. 422; Pinkey, ii. 78; Pirmasens, iv. 162; Prague, ii. 635, iii. 410; Pultava, 240; Pyramids, iv. 304; Quatre Bras, 555; Quebec, iii. 427; Rain, ii. 569; Ramillies, iii. 192; Raslawice, iv. 190; Raucoux, iii. 384; Ravenna, i. 290; Rheinfelden, ii. 698; Rivoli, iv. 255; Rochelle, ii. 543; Rocroi, 615; Roliça, iv. 474; Rossbach, iii. 413; Roveredo, iv. 254; Rumersheim, iii. 196; Saalfeld, iv. 423; Sacile, 483; St. Aubin, i. 166; St. Fabriano, 101; St. Gothard, iii. 106; St. Jean de Luz, iv. 540; St. Quentin, ii. 123; St. Sebastian, iv. 540; St. Vincent, Cape, 284; Salamanca, 500; Salenkemen, iii. 114; Sangershausen, 416; Saragossa, iii. 198, iv. 474, 496; Sarno, iii. 198; Sebastopol, iv. 660 sq.; Seminara, i. 217, 237; Sempach, i. 30; Senef, iii. 98; Sievershausen, ii. 101; Sigeth, ii. 191; Silistria, iv. 603, 659; Simpach, iii. 368; Sinope, iv. 658; Sintzheim, iii. 97; Sittard, i. 601; Smolensk, iv. 516; Sobota, iii. 45; Solebay, ii. 93; Somo-Sierra, iv. 477; Sorr, iii. 380; Splitter, iii. 126; Spurs, i 346; Stadtlohn, ii. 547; Staffarda, iii. 155; Stängebro, ii. 518; Steinkirch, iii. 157; Stockach, iv. 318; Striegau, iii. 380; Talavera, iv. 497; Tann, 481; Tarragona, 500; Tewkesbury, i. 136; Tirlemont, iv. 598; Tokay, i. 523; Torgau, iii. 422; Tortosa, iv. 500; Toulouse, 546; Tourcoign, 216; Trafalgar, 408; Trebbia, 322; Troia, i. 102; Tschernaja, iv. 662; Tudela, 477; Türckheim, iii. 97; Turnhout, ii. 372; iv. 398; Upsala, 509; Valeggio, iv. 549; Valmy, iv. 112; Varna, i. 18; Vasag, i. 16; Vegliana, ii. 561; Vesoul, i. 155; Vienna, i. 525; iii. 108 sq.; Villa Viciosa, iii. 198; Vimeira, iv. 474; Vittoria, 533, 539; Wagram, 485; Walk, iii. 62; Waterloo, iv. 556; Wattignies, 161; Widsjo, ii. 520; Wimpfen, 500; Wittstock, ii. 594; Zarnova, iii. 45; Zenta, 115; Zorndorf, 418
Bautrec, ii. 534
Bavaria, its divisions, i. 22; progress of reformation in, 500; a kingdom, iv. 407
Bavarian Succession, war of the, iii. 472 sq.
Bayanne, Cardinal, iv. 457

BAYARD

Bayard, i. 235, 270, 278, 287, 302, 356; death, 440
Bayonet introduced, iii. 158, *note.*
Bayonne, treaty of, iv. 469
Bazire, iv. 84
Béarn, annexed to France, ii. 493
Beaton, Cardinal, ii. 77
Beaufort, Duke de, iii. 7, 8
Beauharnais, Al., iv. 146
— Eugène, iv. 411, 413. (*See* Eugène.)
Beaulieu, General, iv. 239-248
Beaumarchais, iii. 524, iv. 110
Beaumont, Christophe de, archbishop, iii. 406
Beausobre, iii. 141
Bedford, Regent of France, i. 64
Bedmar, Marquis of, ii. 477
Belgian provinces, decline of, ii. 420
— annexed to Holland, iv. 548; disturbances in, iv. 595; independence declared, 597; becomes a kingdom, 598
Belgrade, Peace of, iii. 334
Bellarmine, his doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, ii. 311; candidate for the Papacy, 441
Bellay, Cardinal du, i. 605; ii. 74
— Martin du, i. 479
Bellegarde, Count, iv. 318 sqq., 480, 549 sq.
Belle-Isle, Marshal, iii. 348 sqq., 367, 385 sqq.
Bem, General, iv. 642 sq.
Bembo, Pietro, i. 342
Bender, Marshal, iii. 504; iv. 234
Benedict XIII., Pope, iii. 312
— XIV., iv. 22
Benedictines, patrons of learning, i. 336
Benkels, Wm., ii. 23
Bennigsen, General, iv. 429
Benningen, Van, iii. 80
Bentinck, Earl of Portland, iii. 163, 168
—, Lord Wm., iv. 491, 549
Beresford, Marshal, iv. 496 sqq., 546, 572
Bergerac, Peace of, ii. 282
Berlin, treaty of, 1742, iii. 358
— Decree, iv. 436
Bernadotte, Chas. John, iv. 262 sq. 273, 302, 317, 322, 331 sqq.; Prince of Ponte Corvo, 413, 423; commands the Saxons, 481; elected Crown Prince of Sweden, 505; alliance with Russia, 507 sqq.; scheme against Napoleon, 528; becomes King of Sweden, 578. (*See* Charles XIV.)
Bernhard of Saxe-Weimar, Duke, ii. 550; takes service under Gustavus Ad., 565; progress, 567; advances on the Tyrol, 571; takes command of Swedish army, 575; takes Ratisbon, 577; campaign of 1634, 585; defeated at Nördlingen, 586; enters the service of France, *ib.*; treaty with Louis XIII., 593; campaign of 1638, 598; death, 599
Bernis, Abbé, iii. 399
Bernstorff, Count, iii. 405
Bernstorf, Peter Andrew von, iii. 494, 506; iv. 95, 198, 345 sqq.
Bernwald, treaty of, ii. 557
Berri, Duke of, assassinated, iv. 565
—, Duchess of, in La Vendée, iv. 604
Berryer, M., iv. 611
Berthier de Savigny, iv. 52
—, Marshal, iv. 285 sqq., 313, 330 sqq., 413
Bertrand, General, iv. 536

BÉRULLE

Bérulle, Sieur de, ii. 540
Berwick, Duke of, iii. 186, 190 sqq., 200, 305 sqq., 322
Bessarion, Cardinal, i. 90 sqq.
Bessières, Marshal, iv. 473, 477
Bestuscheff, Chancellor, iii. 412, 443
Bethlem-Gabor, ii. 490 sq., 502, 505 sq., 550
Beylerbey, what, i. 12
Beytasch, Hadji, i. 6
Beza, ii. 153, 155, 158, 161, 166, 200, 336, 429
Bibliotheca Laurentiana, i. 103
Bignon, iv. 592, 603
Billaud Varennes, iv. 100, 111, 147, 160, 171 sqq., 210 sqq.
Birago, ii. 181, 208; bad commercial system of, 408
Biron, Marshal, ii. 345, 318, 412, 429
— Duke of Courland, iii. 330 sqq., 352, 448 sqq.
Bischofswerder, iv. 74, 80, 282
Black Brunswickers, iv. 488
Bladus of Wallachia, i. 91
Blainville, ii. 534
Blake, Admiral, iii. 17, 20, 23
—, General, iv. 477, 497
Blanc, Louis, iv. 621, 623; minister of "progress," 624 sq.
Blanqui, iv. 609, 625, 648
Blockade, paper, iv. 344
Blois, treaty of, (1504), i. 244; (1505), 249; (1510), 277
Blücher, Marshal, iv. 424 sqq., 442, 525 sqq., 534, 542, 559, 557
Blum, Robert, iv. 640, 642
Boabdil, or Abu Abdullah, i. 190
Bockelsohn, Jan (John of Leyden), i. 567 sqq.
Bocskai, Stephen, ii. 387; made King of Hungary by the Turks, 388; death, 491
Boëtie, La, ii. 75
Bogislaus IV. of Pomerania, ii. 557
Bohemia, learning in, i. 329; heresy of, 330, becomes an hereditary monarchy, ii. 168; insurrection against Rodolph, ii. 447; against Matthias, 485; submits to Ferdinand, 497
Boissy, d'Anglas, iv. 274
Bojars, Russian, iii. 219
Boleyn, Ann, i. 349, 471, 553
Bolingbroke, Lord, iv. 16, 19
Bolivar, Simon, iv. 567
Bologna, congress at, i. 280; juridical school of, iii. 269
Bombay, transferred to England, iii. 67
Bombs, invented, ii. 330
Bompart, Admiral, iv. 305
Bonaparte, Jerome, King of Westphalia, iv. 450; marriage with Miss Patterson, 456; Russian campaign, 514; flight, 535; Governor of the *Invalides*, 627
—, Joseph, embassy to Rome, iv. 267 sq.; at Luneville, 340; at Amiens, 356; expedition to Naples, 411; King of the Two Sicilies, 412; King of Spain, 470; flies from Madrid, 473; returns, 496; expedition to Andalusia, 498; flies into France, 530; prepares to defend Paris, 544; flies to Switzerland, 546
—, Louis, King of Holland, iv. 414; refuses the Crown of Spain, 470; disputes with Napoleon, 492 sq.; abdicates, 494
—, Lucien, iv. 333; embassy to Madrid, 342; refuses the throne of Portugal, 460; after Waterloo, 556
—, Caroline, iv. 413

BRAGA

Bonaparte, Eliza, iv. 342, 413; Grand Duchess of Tuscany, 491
—, Pauline, iv. 413
Bonchamps, iv. 133, 156
Boniface VIII., Pope, his pretensions, i. 326
Bonne of Savoy, Regent of Milan, i. 106; expelled, 110
Bonner, Bishop, i. 555
Bonneval, Count, iii. 332
Bonnier, iv. 283, 297, 307, 319
Bonnivet, Admiral, i. 413, 438, 440, 445; death, 447
Bordeaux, parliament established, i. 117; cruelties of Montmorenci at, ii. 75
—, Duke of (Henry V.), iv. 565, 649
Borghese, Cardinal, ii. 441. (*See* Paul V.)
—, Prince Camille, iv. 550
Borgia, family of, i. 100
—, Francis, Duke of Gandia, murdered, i. 221
— — — —, ii. 398; prosecuted by the Inquisition, *ib.*
—, Cæsar, i. 210, 221; in France, 225; made Duke of Valentinois, 226; his conquests, 231; murders his brother-in-law, *ib.*; usurpations, 237; decline of his power, 241; imprisoned by Pope Julius, 242; death, *ib.*
—, Lucretia, marries Sforza, i. 179; divorced, 221; marries Alphonso, Duke of Biseglia, 230; marries Alphonso d'Este, 232
Boris, Godunow, ii. 395
Borromeo, Count, iv. 636
—, Cardinal Charles, ii. 147, 173, 177
Boscawen, Admiral, iii. 394, 420 sq.
Bossu, ii. 303
Bossuet, iii. 138, 290
Botero, Giovanni, ii. 410, 414
Boufflers, Marshal, iii. 161, 163, 181 sqq., 195
Bouillé, Marquis de, iv. 71 sqq., 81, 107
Bouillon, restored by Henry II. to the La Marcks, ii. 93
—, Duke of, intrigues against Henry IV., ii. 441; iii. 7, 9
Boulogne, surrendered to France, ii. 78
Bourbons, family, ii. 59, 345, *note.*
Bourbon, Antony of, i. 577, 603; marries Jeanne d'Albret, 591
—, Charles de, Constable, i. 351; governor of the Milanese, 359; his possessions, 432; rupture with Francis I., 433; negociations with Charles V., 434; and Wolsey, *ib.*; flies from France, 436; declared a traitor, 438; swears fealty to Henry VIII., 441; invades France, 442; negociations with England, 453; visits Charles V. at Toledo, 461; marriage with emperor's sister broken off, 461; expedition to Rome, 476; death, 480
—, John, Duke of, i. 121, 125
—, Cardinal of, ii. 294, 295, 341; proclaimed as Charles X., 346; death, 350
Bourdon de l'Oise, iv. 100, 169 sq.
Bourges, university at, established, i. 117
Bourguignons, i. 63
Bourmont, General, iv. 586
Bournonville, General, iv. 112, 252
Bovadilla, Francis de, i. 322
Boyl, Father, i. 321
Braga, Archbishop, conspiracy of, ii. 629

BRAHE

Brahe, Count Nils, ii. 574
—, Count Peter, 596
Brandenburg, Count, iv. 642
Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, i. 351; invades France, 435; approaches Paris, 437
Brandt, Sebastian, i. 337
Branitchi, iv. 183 sqq.
Brazil, ii. 14; Empire of, iv. 573
"Bread and cheese folk," i. 169
Breda, Peace of, iii. 74
Brederode, victory, ii. 234 sqq.
Bréteuil, Baron de, iv. 47, 75
Breuil, Peter du, burnt, i. 611
Briçonnet, Bishop of St. Malo, i. 210
Brienne, Archbishop of Toulouse, iii. 544 sqq.; iv. 34, 72
Brihuega, capitulation of, iii. 198
Brissac, Marshal, ii. 81, 93, 102, 109, 861
—, Duke de, iv. 90, 109
Brissot, iv. 65, 78, 84 sqq., 97, 100, 115, 127 sqq., 138, 142, 159 sqq.
Brissotins, iv. 84
Bristol, Lord, iii. 429
Brittany, Duchy of, i. 718
Broderith, Hungarian Chancellor, i. 519
Broglie, Marshal, iii. 368, 416 sqq., 431; iv. 47
Brömsebro, Peace of, ii. 620
"Brothers of the Sword," Order of the, ii. 516
Broussel, iii. 6, 14
Browne, Marshal, iii. 404, 410
Brownists, iii. 278
Brühl, Count, iii. 350, 357, 376, 381, 401
Bruevs, Admiral, iv. 301
Bruges, treaty of, i. 413
Brun, Antoine, ii. 632
Brune, Marshal, iv. 294 sqq., 326, 340, 442, 563
Brunellesehi, i. 103
Brunswick, Henry, Duke of, ii. 101;
—, Christian, Duke of, ii. 500 sq., 546 sq.; death, 550
—, Ferdinand, Duke of, iii. 403, 414 sqq., 431 sqq.
—, Ferdinand, Duke of, iv. 88, 95 sqq., 107, 113, 162 sqq., 214, 422 sqq.; death, 426
—, William, Duke of, iv. 488; retires to England, 489; killed, 555
—, Charles, Duke of, deposed, iv. 602
—, William, Duke of, *ib.*
Brussels, Peace of, i. 366
Bubna, Count, iv. 526
Bucharest, Peace of, iv. 504, 580
Buckingham, Duke of, ii. 526 sqq., 531 sqq., 540 sqq.
Buckhurst, Lord, ii. 323
Bucquoi, General, ii. 486
Bugeaud, Marshal, iv. 612, 621 sq., 627
Bull, Golden, i. 308
Bullinger, i. 401
Bülow, General, iv. 534, 556
Bulwer, Sir H. Lytton, iv. 654
Bundschuh, i. 507
Buonaroti, Michael Angelo, i. 297; fortifies Florence, 528
Bureau, Jean, i. 70
Buren, Count, ii. 245
Burgoyne, General, iii. 437, 523, 525
Burgundy, early history, i. 65; causes of its weakness, 69
Burke, iii. 506; iv. 25
Burrard, Sir H., iv. 474
Burton, Edward, ii. 383
Busbequius, ii. 173
Bute, Lord, iii. 427, 431 sqq., 441
Butler, Colonel, ii. 581 sqq.
Buxhövden, iv. 395, 400, 448

BUZOT

Buzot, iv. 68, 116, 142, 153
Byng, Admiral, iii. 194, 305, 401
Byron, Admiral, iii. 527, 529
Byron, Lord, iv. 582

CABAL, Cabinet, iii. 81
Cabet, iv. 625
Cabot, Sebastian, i. 324; ii. 418
Cabral, Alvarez, i. 313, 323
Cabrera, General, iv. 617
Cadan, Peace of, i. 570
Cadiaskers, what, i. 12
Cadis, what, i. 13
Cadiz, English expedition against (1625), ii. 535
Cadoudal, George, iv. 377
Cajetanus, i. 389
Calais taken by Guise, ii. 125
Calas, case of, iv. 20
Calatrava, order of, i. 60
Calder, Sir R., iv. 392
Calendar, French Republic, iv. 153
Caliphate, transferred to the Ottoman Turks, i. 3
Calixtines, what, i. 32, 330
Calixtus III., Pope, i. 85; refuses to recognise Ferdinand of Naples, 99; death, 100
Calmar, Union of, ii. 506 sqq.
Calonne, iii. 542 sq.; iv. 34, 74, 81, 86, 89
Calvin, John, i. 571; ii. 6; his doctrines more popular than the Lutheran, 7; his political opinions, *ib.*; intolerance, 8, *note*; influence in France, 135; burns Servetus, 136; advice to King Antony, 150; death, 176
Calvinism, progress of, ii. 392
Cambacérès, iv. 322, 335, 380, 523, 554
Cambray, League of, i. 263; hypocrisy and duplicity of the allies, 264; Peace of, 494
Cambridge, Duke of, iv. 659
Camerarius, ii. 489
Campanella, Thomas, iii. 407
Campeggio, legate, i. 490, 504, 506, 588
Campo Formio, treaty of, iv. 278
Camus, iv. 135
Canada, discovered, ii. 14
Canino, Prince Charles of, iv. 645
Canisius, the Jesuit, ii. 170, 394 sq.
Canning, George, iv. 430; seizes the Danish fleet, 438; supports the Spaniards, 476; aids the Greeks, 582; Greek policy, 584; intervention in Portugal, 615
—, Sir Stratford (Lord Redcliffe), iv. 610, 657
Canrobert, General, iv. 660 sq.
Cantacuzene, Manuel, i. 76
Cantemir, Demetrius, iii 243
Cape of Good Hope, discovered, i. 313
Capestrano, Giovanni da, i. 84, 86; death, 87
Capodistrias, Count, iv. 584 sq.
Capuchins, origin of the, ii. 9
Caraccioli, i. 53 sq.
Caraccioli, Marquis, iv. 326
Caraffa, Cardinal, ii. 9 sqq.
Carbonari, the, iv. 574, 576
Cardinals, origin, names, &c., i. 39
Cardona, Don Raymond de, i. 285, 287, 293, 343 sq.
Carlists, iv. 613
Carlos, Don, son of John II. of Aragon, i. 182 sq.
— —, son of Philip II., story of, ii. 185 sq.
— —, son of Philip V., obtains Parma and Tuscany, iii. 310, 314 sq.; becomes King of the Two Sicilies, 323. (*See* Charles III.)

CATHERINE

Carlos, Don, brother of Ferdinand VII., iv. 612 sq.; in Biscay, 614; attempt on Madrid, 617; flight, 618
Carlowitz, Peace of, iii. 116
Carlsbad, Congress at, iv. 578
Carlstadt, i. 392, 498
Carmagniole, the, iv. 130
Carnot, iv. 136, 160, 231, 239, 243, 274 sq., 554
Caroline, Queen of Naples, iv. 206, 271; sends an embassy to Napoleon, 390; raises an army, 411; Spanish quarrels, 459; driven from Sicily, 492
— Matilda, Queen of Christian VII. of Denmark, iii. 491; intrigue with Struensee, 492; confession and death, 494
— Code, i. 547
Carrier, iv. 133, 159, 169, 212
Carteaux, iv. 143, 156 sq.
Carteret, Lord, iii. 368 sqq.
Cartier, Jacques, ii. 14
Carvajal, Don Jos. de, iii. 423
Casa di S. Giorgio, what, i. 82, *note*.
Casa Lanzi, Convention, iv. 554
Casimir, elected king by the Hussites, i. 33; invades Hungary, 195
Castaldo, General, ii. 96
Castaños, General, iv. 473
Castel Rodrigo, Marquis, iii. 77, 79
Castile, Kingdom of, i. 56; constitution, 59; subjected to Rome, 333
Castlereagh, Lord (Earl of Londonderry), iv. 411; reply to Napoleon's proposals, 510; at Châtillon, 542; at Vienna, 551
Castriot, John, i. 19, 96
Casuists, Spanish, iii. 270
Catalans, revolt of, i. 184; proclaim John of Anjou King, *ib.*; rise against Philip IV., ii. 602; establish a republic, 603; union with France, 607
Catalonia, united to Aragon, i. 60; reunited to Spain, iii. 16
Câteau-Cambrésis, treaty, ii. 128; spirit of that treaty, 134
Cathelineau, iv. 133
Catheart, Lord, iv. 402, 439
Catherine of Aragon, marries Prince Arthur, i. 220, 250; detained in England, 251; divorced, 553
— Jagellonica, ii. 516 sq.
— I. origin, iii. 235; marries Czar Peter, 244; joins the Alliance of Vienna, 312; death, *ib.*
— II. of Russia, iii. 434; character, 443 sq.; deposes her husband, Peter III., iii. 444; usurps the throne, *ib.*; administration, 446; peace with Denmark, 447; reinstates Biron in Courland, 448; family, 449; procures the election of Stanislaus Poniatowski in Poland, 450; interferes for the Polish dissidents, 453; war with Turkey, 458; projects on Greece, 460; treaty with Frederick II. regarding Poland, 464; share of Poland, 465; guarantees the Peace of Teschen, 474; alliance with Joseph II., 484; visits Cherson, 486; war with Turkey, 487; peace with Sweden, 496; refuses to accede to the Convention of Reichenbach, 505; peace with Turkey, 506; opinion of the Armed Neutrality, 534; correspondence with Voltaire, iv. 18; views of French Revolution, 74, 88; proposes an alliance to the Poles, 180; resolves to

CATINAT
sacrifice Poland, 184; manifesto against the new Constitution, 185; takes possession of part of Poland, 188; Convention with the Republic, 189; severity towards Polish insurgents, 195; seizes Courland, 196; death, *ib.*; character and projects, 197; supported Gustavus III., 199
Catinat, iii. 155 sqq., 162, 178
Cavaignac, General, iv. 625, 626 sq., 650
Cavalry, i. 304; of Eastern Europe, 306
Cavelier de la Salle, iii. 279
Cellamare, his conspiracy, iii. 305
Centralisation in France, ii. 411; effects of, iv. 37
Ceri, Renzo da, i. 479
Cervantes, ii. 195
Cevallos, don Pedro, iv. 465
Chabaz Gherai, iii. 487
Chabot, iv. 84, 91, 114
Chalier, iv. 143
Chambre Ardente, the, ii. 137
Chambre de St. Louis, iii. 5
Chambres de Réunion, iii. 130
Championnet, General, iv. 313 sq.
Chancellor, Richard, ii. 418
Changarnier, General, iv. 624, 649
Chantonay, Perrenot de, ii. 156
Charette, Athanase, iv. 133, 227, 228
Charles VII. of France, i. 70, 113; seizes Dauphiné, 115; obtains Genoa, *ib.*
— VIII. of France, birth, i. 137; accession, 159; subdues the Duke of Brittany, 166; liberates the Duke of Orleans, 170; marries Anne of Brittany, *ib.*; treaty with Henry VII., 172; with Ferdinand and Isabella, *ib.*; prepares to invade Italy, 203; enters Florence, 206; at Rome, 207; treaty with the Pope, 210; enters Naples, 212; league against him formed at Venice, 213; assumes the *insignia* of Emperor of the East, *ib.*; retreats, 215; defeats the Italians, 216; death, 223
— IX. of France, accession, ii. 149; declared of age, 167; lures the Hugonots, 200; character, 201; apparent confidence in Coligni, 203; goes to see him burnt, 212; his perfidy, 254; acknowledges the St. Bartholomew massacre, 267; death, 273
— X. of France, iv. 578; coronation, 579; ordinances of July, 587 sq.; abdicates in favour of the Duke of Bordeaux, 592; flies to England, 593; retires to Prague, 604
— V., Emperor, affianced to Claude, daughter of Louis XII., i. 235; to Mary, sister of Henry VIII., 346; assumes the government of the Netherlands, 352; becomes King of Spain (as Charles I.), 362; lands in Spain, 367; his unpopular measures, 368; elected Emperor, 376; the Spaniards oppose his accepting that dignity, 377; visits England, 378; coronation, 379; seizes Würtemberg, 380; policy respecting Luther, 392, 395; dismisses him from Worms, 399; publishes Edict of Worms, 400; treaty with the Pope, 410; visits England, 421; wise government in Spain, 423; persecutes the Moors, 424; breaks with Wolsey, 455; released from match with Princess Mary, *ib.*; truce with France, 456; hard terms proposed to Francis, 457; visits Francis, 459; impolicy of his conduct, 464; marries Isabella of Portugal, 470; his knowledge of Bourbon's expedition, 479; policy on capture of the Pope, 483; concludes a treaty with Clement, 485; reconciliation with that pontiff, 491; challenges Francis, 493; ill treatment of the French princes, 494; forbids the Diet of Spires, 505; applauds the anti-Lutheran league, 514; journey to Italy, 527; at Bologna, 529; coronation, 530; proceeds to Germany, 531; annuls the recess of the Diet of Spires, *ib.*; at Augsburg, 536; second interview with Clement VII., 552; African expedition, 559; again challenges Francis, 564; invades France, 565; besieges Marseilles, *ib.*; meets Francis at Nice, 575; at Aigues Mortes, 578; alliance with France, 580; proceedings in Spain, 583; passes through France, 585; invests his son Philip with the Milanese, 587; confirms the League of Nuremberg, 589; forbearance towards the Protestants, 590; alliance with Landgrave of Hesse, 591; and Joachim II. of Brandenburg, *ib.*; expedition to Algiers, 596; alliance with Henry VIII., 598; interview with the Pope, 601; punishes the Duke of Clèves, 260; at Diet of Spires, 605; concessions to the Protestants, 606; invades France, 608; treaty of Crespy, 609; altered policy towards Protestants, 611; persecutions in Netherlands, *ib.*; prepares war against the Protestants, ii. 34; forms several alliances, 35; treaty with the Pope, 36; bans the Elector of Saxony and Landgrave of Hesse, 38; successes in the Smalcaldic war, 42; visits Luther's grave, 48; his conduct towards the Landgrave of Hesse examined, 51; his parsimony, 53; breach with Paul III., 62, 65; at Augsburg, 66; suspected of procuring the assassination of Farnese, 67; protests against the removal of the Council of Trent, 68; his edict of reformation, 70; visits the Netherlands, 76; religious persecutions there, 80, 223; apprehended plans against England, 83; surprised by the Elector Maurice, 89; flies into Carinthia, 91; deliberations about deposing him, 94; besieges Metz, 98; retires, 99; campaign in the Netherlands (1553), 102; plans the marriage of Philip and Mary, 103; counsels the execution of Lady Jane Grey, 105; declining health, 111; abdicates in favour of Philip, 113; resigns the Imperial crown to Ferdinand, 114; retires to Spain, 129; abode at Yuste, 130; death, 131; his council of state, 132
Charles VI., Emperor, iii. 200; rejects a peace, 204, 207; concludes the Peace of Rastadt, 207; his Pragmatic Sanction, 310; secret treaty with Philip V., 311; treaty with Spain, 314 sq.; war with the Turks, 332 sq.; death, 338
— VII., Emperor, iii. 356; loses Munich, *ib.*; flies to Augsburg, 368; retires to Frankfort, 370; alliance with Prussia, &c., 375; death, 378
Charles II. of Spain, birth, iii. 70; war with France, 77; feebleness, 159; peace with France, 162; recalls Don John, 165; marries Maria Louisa of Orleans, *ib.*; second marriage to Mary Anne of Neuburg, 166; portrait of by Louis XIV., 167; will, 169; submits the question of his succession to the Pope, 170; fresh will in favour of Duke of Anjou, 171; death, *ib.*
— III. of Spain, iii. 425; Family Compact, 429; war with England, 432; invades Portugal, 437; peace with England, 438; suppresses the Jesuits, 516; requires the Pope to abolish them, 518; war with England, 528
— IV. of Spain, iv. 130; peace with French Republic, 226; war with Great Britain, 256; treatment of Godoy, 300; war with Russia, 325; conduct to Portugal, 342; recognises Napoleon as Emperor, 381; oppressed by that conqueror, 450; plans of resistance, 451; attempted flight, 463; abdicates, 464; at Bayonne, 468; signs the treaty of Bayonne, 469
— I. of England, marriage, ii. 533; foreign policy, 535; aids his brother-in-law, the Elector Palatine, 548; renounces the protection of the Hugonots, 560; answer to Richelieu, 601; shelters Mary de' Medicis, *ib.*; executed, iii. 16
— II. of England, visits France, iii. 13; on the Bidassoa, 33; restored, 67; marries Catherine of Braganza, *ib.*; sells Dunkirk, 71; hatred of De Witt, 72; war with the Dutch, *ib.*; fire of London, 74; Peace of Breda, *ib.*; alliance with France, 81; secret treaty, 82; declares war against the Dutch, 88; peace with Holland, 96; subsidised by Louis XIV., 99; turns against him, 100; renews the secret treaty, 101; abortive mediation, 134; alliance with Spain, *ib.*; again brought by Louis, 135; his court, 258
— III., King of the Two Sicilies, iii. 323; forced to become neutral, 359; opposes the Austrians, 373; assumes the crown of Spain, 425
— Knutson (Charles VIII.), King of Sweden, ii. 507
— IX. of Sweden, ii. 518 sq.; death, 520
— X. of Sweden, accession, iii. 38; warlike projects, 39; treaty with England, 44; invades Poland, *ib.*; defeats John Casimir, 45; defeats the Elector of Brandenburg, 48; retreats to Warsaw, 49; allies himself with the Elector of Brandenburg, *ib.*; defeats John Casimir, 50; treaty with Cromwell, 52; with Ragoczi, *ib.*; evacuates Poland, 54; invades Denmark, 55; proposes its partition to Cromwell, 56; crosses the ice, 57; at Copenhagen, 58; peace with Denmark, *ib.*; gigantic schemes, 59; again invades Denmark, 60; assaults Copenhagen, 61; death, 63
— XI. of Sweden, iii. 122; marries Ulrica Eleanora of Denmark, 124; threatens Zealand, *ib.*; concludes the Peace of Lunden, 127; ren-

CHARLES
ders himself absolute, i. 128; institutes the "Reduction," *ib.*; character of his reign, 129; treaty with the Dutch, 133; with Brandenburg, 142; death, 213
Charles XII. of Sweden, iii. 213; prepares for war, 221; alliance with Holland and England, 222; invades Denmark, *ib.*; expedition against the Russians, 224; occupies Courland, 226; refuses peace, *ib.*; enters Warsaw, 227; occupies Cracow, 228; takes Thorn, 229; expedition to Lemberg, 231; recaptures Warsaw, *ib.*; peace with Polish Republic, 232; expedition against Grodno, 233; into Volhynia, *ib.*; invades Saxony, 234; invades Russia, 237; planless campaigns, 238; in the Ukraine, 239; defeated at Pultava, 240; flies to Bender, 241; league against, *ib.*; at the Pruth, 245; defence at Varnitza, 246; returns to Sweden, *ib.*; invades Prussia, 247; invades Norway, 249; besieges Frederikshald, 252; killed, *ib.*
— XIII. of Sweden, adheres to the Continental System, iv. 449; adopts Bernadotte, 506; declares war against England, *ib.*; peace, 508; joins the Coalition, 528; death, 578
— XIV. of Sweden, iv. 578; death, 634
—, Duke of Sudermania, iv. 200; accepts the Swedish crown, 449. (*See* Charles XIII.)
— III. of Savoy, i. 422, 562; attempts on Geneva, 563; robbed by his relations, 575; ii. 103
— Emanuel of Savoy, defeated by Lesdiguières, ii. 355; plots against Henry IV., 428 sqq.; death, 561
— — II. of Savoy, iii. 132
— — III. of Sardinia, iii. 320, 351, 359, 371 sqq.
— — IV. of Sardinia, iv. 212, 297; abdicates, 314, 368
— Felix of Sardinia, iv. 575; death, 607
— Albert, Prince of Carignano, iv. 575; becomes King of Sardinia, 607; liberal policy, 636; seizes Milan, 637; refuses to join the Italian league, 638; defeated, 640; renews the war, 643; overthrow and death, *ib.*
— Gustavus, son of John Casimir, Count Palatine, appointed successor to the Swedish crown, iii. 37. (*See* Charles X.)
— the Bold, of Burgundy (Count Charolais), his character, i. 114; invested with Normandy, 118; marches to Paris, 122; treatment of Dinant and Liége, 126; becomes Duke of Burgundy, *ib.* character, 127; marries Margaret of York, 128; seizes Louis XI., 129; project of a Burgundian Kingdom, 130; receives a French embassy, 134; summoned by Parliament of Paris, 136; invades France, 137; surnamed the "Terrible," 139; penetrates into Normandy, 139; his ambitious projects, 141; obtains possession of Guelderland, *ib.*; interview with Frederick III., 142; besieges Neuss, 143; league with Edward IV., 144; conquers Lorraine, 146; attacks the Swiss, *ib.*; defeated at Granson, 148; at Morat, 149; death, 150
Charles, Duke of Berri, i. 122 sq., 128, 131, 137; death, 138
— — — Lorraine, abdicates in favour of his brother, ii. 587, enters the Emperor's service, *ib.*
— IV. of Lorraine, iii. 16, 33, 83
— V. of Lorraine, iii. 103, 110 sqq., 154; death, 156, and 163, *note* (*Testament Politique*)
—, Prince of Lorraine, iii. 357 sq., 363, 376, 380 sqq., 410 sqq.
—, Archduke, destined to the Spanish succession, iii. 167; proclaimed King of Spain, 185; proceeds to England and Portugal, *ib.* 186; proclaimed in Valencia as Charles III., 189; proclaimed in Aragon, 190; in Barcelona, 195; marriage, *ib.*; recognised by the Pope, 197; enters Madrid, 198; succeeds to the Austrian dominions, 199; becomes Emperor, 200. (*See* Charles VI.)
— — in Netherlands, iv. 135, 145, 235; German campaign in 1796, 248, 251, 253; in Italy and Styria, 1796-97, 262 sqq; in Germany and Switzerland, 1799, 318, 323, 340; in Italy and Austria, 1805, 394 sqq.; in Germany, 1809, 480 sqq.
— Albert, of Bavaria, claims the Austrian succession, iii. 339; invades Austria, 352; crowned King of Bohemia, 363; treaty with Frederick II., 366, elected Emperor, *ib.* (*See* Charles VII.)
— Theodore, Elector of Bavaria, iv. 162
— Louis, son of the Elector Palatine Frederick V., ii. 600
— Theodore, Elector Palatine, succeeds to Bavaria, iii. 472; cedes the quarter of the Inn, 474
— Gustavus, of Kleeburg, ii. 622
— Peter Ulric, of Holstein Gottorp, iii. 365
Charlotte, Queen of Portugal, refuses the Constitution, iv. 572
—, sister of Christian VIII. of Denmark, iv. 629
Chartres, Vidame de, ii. 143
—, Duke de, iv. 65; at Valmy, 112; at Jemappes, 116; flies with Dumouriez, 135. (*See* Louis Philippe)
Chassé, General, iv. 598 sq.
Chasteler, Marquis Von, iv. 481 sq.
Chateaubriand, iv. 569, 587, 594, 604
Châtel, Jean, ii. 363
Chatham, Lord, aids Frederick II., iii. 413; offers to restore Gibraltar, 424; negociations with Choiseul, 428-430; resigns, 431; warning about America, 523
—, Earl, iv. 489
Châtillon, Congress, iv. 542
Chaumette, iv. 154 sqq., 166 sqq.
Chaumont, treaty of, iv. 543
Chauvelin, iii. 323; iv. 123 sqq.
Chaves, Marquis de, iv. 615
Chénier, Marie Jos., iv. 168
Chersón, founded, iii. 486
Chesterfield, Lord, iv. 32
Cheyney, Sir Thos., i. 470
Chiauses, what, i. 5
Chiaus Baschi, what, i. 12
Chieregato, legate, i. 504
Chicrasoo, Peace of, ii. 562
Chigi, Cardinal, ii. 623, iii. 70
Chios, taken by the Turks, ii. 190
Chmelnicki, iii. 42 sq.
Choiseul, Duke de, iii. 419 sqq., 427 sqq., 456, 469, 507 sqq.
Cholpicki, General, iv. 600
Chouans, iv. 227
Christians, in Turkey, ii. 425
Christian Commonwealth, scheme of a, iii. 267
Christian of Oldenburg, King of Denmark (Christian I.), ii. 507
— II. of Denmark, ii. 507; his democratical principles, 508; alliances, *ib.*; invades Sweden, 509; obtains the crown, *ib.*; cruelties, *ib.*; burns the Bishop of Lund, 511; deposition, 512; expedition to Norway, 513; imprisoned, *ib.*
— III. of Denmark, i. 597; ii. 514; completes the Reformation, 515; divides his kingdom with his brothers, *ib* ; death, 515
— IV. of Denmark, ii. 517, 519; war with Sweden, *ib.*; intervenes in the affairs of Germany, 546; accident to, 548; takes the field, 550; defeated at Lutter, 551; relieves Stralsund, 553; makes peace with the Emperor, 554; obtains Bremen, 593; breach with Sweden, 617
— V. of Denmark, iii. 123; inveigles and arrests Duke Christian of Holstein, 123; treaty with the Elector of Brandenburg, *ib.*; war with the Swedes, 124; makes peace, 127; death, 129, 215
— VI. of Denmark, iii. 360; aims at the Swedish throne for his son, 366
— VII. of Denmark, iii. 491; marries Caroline Matilda, *ib.*; death, iv. 198
— VIII. of Denmark, iv. 629; extends the law of female succession, *ib.*; death, 630
— I. of Saxony, ii. 452
— II. of Saxony, ii. 452
— Albert, Duke of Holstein Gottorp, iii. 123
— Augustus of Schleswig Holstein Augustenburg, iv. 505, 629
— of Anhalt, ii. 489, 496
Christina of Sweden, ii. 617; assumes the government, 619; character, iii. 36; abdicates, 38; death, *ib. note.*
—, Archduchess, governess of the Netherlands, iii. 483; flight, 499; return, 504
—(Maria), Queen of Spain, iv. 612 sq.; regent, 613; proclaims the Constitution of 1812, 617; resigns the regency, 618; returns to Spain, 654; seizes power, 655; abuses it, *ib.*
Christinos, iv. 613
Christopher of Bavaria, king of Denmark, ii. 507
Church, General, iv. 574, 584
Cibò, Cardinal, i. 577
Cilly, Count, revolt of, i. 83; governs Hungary, 87; designs against the Emperor and Hunyad, *ib.*; murdered, 88
Cinq-Mars, conspiracy of, ii. 611 sq.
Cinque Ports, an independent confederacy, ii. 26
Cintra, Convention of, iv. 475
Cisalpine Republic, iv. 270, called "Italian Republic," 336; becomes Kingdom of Italy, 389
Cities, European, compared, ii. 415
Citoyen, title, iv. 106
CITOYEN

CIVIL
Civil war in France, ii. 163
Clairfait, Count, iii. 496
Clairfait, General, iv. 107, 134, 145, 215 sqq., 234 sq.
Clarence, Duke of, his rebellion, i. 132, 134; returns to his allegiance, 134
Claris, canon of Urgel, ii. 606
Clarke, General, iv. 258
Claude, Count of Guise, i. 450
Clausewitz, General, iv. 524
Clavière, iv. 104, 142, 150
Clémangis, Nicholas de, i. 329
Clement VII., Pope, i. 439; secret treaty with Francis I., 444; vacillating policy of, 466; forms the Holy League, 468; absolves Francis I. from his oath to treaty of Madrid, 468; captured, 473; capitulates to Bourbon's army, 482; liberated by Charles V., 485; advice to Henry VIII., 490; reconciled with Charles V., 491; evokes Henry's divorce to Rome, *ib.*; opposes a General Council, 534; Bull against Henry VIII.'s marriage, 553; cites that monarch to Rome, 554; interview with Francis at Marseilles. *ib.*; provisionally excommunicates Henry VIII., 557; death, *ib.*
— VIII., Pope, character, ii. 356; refuses to receive Henry IV.'s ambassador, 360; absolves Henry, 364; death, 441
— XI., Pope, iii. 178; his extravagant pretensions, *ib.*; recognises Charles III. of Spain, 197; grants the Bull *Unigenitus*, 210; publishes the Bull *Unigenitus*, iii. 289; enmity towards Alberoni, 306; death, 307
— XII., Pope, iii. 351
— XIII., Pope, protects the Portuguese Jesuits, iii. 437, 514; excommunicates the Duke of Parma, 517; death, 518
— XIV., Pope, iii. 476; suppresses the Jesuits, 518; death, 519; character, iv. 207
Clément, Jacques, ii. 344
Clementine, or Holy League, i. 468
Clergy, corruption of the, i. 334
—, French, position, iv. 8; manners, 20; civil constitution, 72
Clermont, Count, iii. 415, 416
Cleves, Anne of, i. 581
Clinton, General, iii. 525, 529
Clissow, battle, iii. 228
Clootz, Anacharsis, iv. 70, 154, 166
Club of 1789, iv. 65; Cordelier, 78, 165; Feuillants, 78; closed, 93
Coburg, Prince Josias of, iv. 134, 135, 145, 160, 215 sqq.
Cockburn, Admiral Sir G., iv. 558
Codrington, Admiral, iv. 585, 598
Cobentzl, Count, iv. 277 sqq., 308, 340
Cochlæus, i. 539
Cochrane, Lord, iv. 584
Cœur, Jacques, i. 70; ii. 24
Coffinhal, iv. 174, 175
Cohorn, engineer, iii. 157
Coigny, Marshal, iii. 374
Colbert de Croissi, iii. 82, 128
—, J. Baptiste, iii. 261 sq.
Coleone, Bartholomew, i. 104
Coligni, Admiral, ii. 122, 124, 140; presents Protestant petition, 143; character, 159; takes up arms, 160; Hugonot commander-in-chief, 165; accused of murdering Guise, 178; at La Rochelle, 181; defeated at Jarnac, 182; goes to the court, 202; political projects

COLLARD
as minister, 203; conspiracy against, 207; wounded, 208; death, 210
Collard, Royer, iv. 565, 579
Colli, General, iv. 239 sq., 261
Collingwood, Admiral, iv. 392
Colloredo, Count, iv. 362
Collot d'Herbois, iv. 147, 158 sq., 168 sqq., 210 sqq.
Cologne, Congress at, ii. 305
—, dispute regarding the electorate, iii. 146 sq.
— sur Sprée, treaty of, iii. 85
Colonisation, progress of, iii. 273
Colonna, Fabrizio, i. 289
—, Prosper, i. 354, 416, 420; death, 440
—, Cardinal Pompeo, i. 473 sqq., 481
Columbus, received by Ferdinand and Isabella, i. 192; life of, 316; voyage to America, 319; second and third voyages, 321; arrested, 322; fourth voyage, *ib.*; death, 323; his colonial system, ii. 15
Comines, Philip de, i. 120 *note*; enters the service of Louis XI., 139
Commerce, erroneous notions on, ii. 17; early European, 18
Committee of Public Welfare, iv. 136; increased, 147; decrees the trial of M. Antoinette, *ib.*; declared *revolutionary*, 151; negociations with Austria, 225
— of General Safety, iv. 136
Commonwealth, English, relations with France, iii. 17; with Spain, 18
Commune, Parisian, iv. 104 sq.
Communeros, iv. 568
Communism, iv. 621
Compactata of Prague, i. 32
Compagnies de Jesus, iv. 213
Compagnies d'Ordonnance, i. 70
Compass invented, i. 310
Complutensian Bible, i. 283
"Compromise," the, ii. 234
Compte Rendu, iii. 542
Conclave, i. 41
Conception, Immaculate, iv. 656
Concini, ii. 431. (*See* d'Ancre, Marshal.)
Concordats, German, i. 333
Condé, Louis, Prince of, ii. 139, 140, 142; cited to court, 143; arrested, 148-150; meets Guise at Paris, 158; begins the civil wars, 160; treaty with England, 162; attacks Paris, 164; captured, 165; plots against the court, 180; flies to La Rochelle, 181; assassinated, 182
—, turns Catholic, ii. 268; chosen leader by the Hugonots, 275, 334; death, 343
—, Henry of, flies to Belgium, ii. 454; abandons his claims to the regency, 459; revolts, 463, 465; arrested, 468
—, the "Great," victory at Rocroi, ii. 615; viceroy of Catalonia, 633; victory at Lens, 635; character, iii. 7; part in the "*Fronde*, *ib.*; insolence, 8; arrested, 9; liberated, 10; *justification*, 11; intrigues with Spain, *ib.*; attacks Paris, 13; enters the Spanish service, 14; recovers his position by the treaty of the Pyrenees, 33, 34; reduces Franche Comté, 76; invades the Netherlands, 89; succeeds Turenne, 98
Condillac, iv. 19
Condorcet, iii 545; iv. 65, 78, 84, 97, 144

CROMWELL
Confederation of the Rhine, iv. 415 sqq.; dissolved, 526
Confessio Tetrapolitana, i. 539
Conflans, treaty, i. 124
Congregation in Scotland, ii. 146
Conrad, poor, league, i. 507
Consistory, Roman, i. 39
Consolato del mare, ii. 27; iii. 530
Constance, Council of, i. 328 sqq.; Diet of, 258
Constant, Benj., iv. 296, 557, 579
Constantine Palæologus, i. 1; death, 75
—, Grand Duke, iv. 513; renounces his title to the throne, 582; tyranny in Poland, 599; conspiracy against, 600; death, 601; —, taken by the French, iv. 608
Constantinople taken, i. 1; state of, at its conquest, 14
Contades, iii. 416 sqq.
Contarini, Cardinal, i. 590; ii. 9, 11
— Venetian senator, ii. 623
Conti, Prince of, iii. 7
Continental System, iv. 436
Convention, Family, iii. 315
Convoy, question of, iv. 347
Copenhagen, treaty of, iii. 64
—, bombarded by Nelson, iv. 349; by Admiral Gambier, 439
Corbey, treaty of, i. 347
Corday, Charlotte, iv. 143
Cornwallis, Lord, iii. 529, 536
Corsica, attacked by the French, ii. 100
—, annexed to France, iii. 508
—, revolution in, iv. 223 sq.; recovered by France, 257
Cortes, Fernando, ii. 13
Cortès, Spanish, dismissed by Charles V., i. 583
Corvinus, John, i. 198
—, Ladislaus, i. 87; beheaded, 88
—, Matthias, i. 87; elected King of Hungary, 89; crowned, 90; successes against the Turks, 92; accused of a treaty with Mahomet II., 97; marries Beatrice of Naples, *ib.*
Cosmas Indicopleustes, i. 314
Cossack, origin of the name, ii. 494, *note*.
Cossacks of the Ukraine, iii. 41 sq.
Cotton, Père, ii. 440, 459
Covenanters, Scotch, demand the mediation of Louis XIII., ii. 601
Coulaincourt, iv. 542, 554
"Council of Blood," the, ii. 244
Courtney, Earl of Devonshire, ii. 104
Court, French, manners of, under Catherine de' Medicis, ii. 201
Couthon, iv. 121, 147, 159, 165, 169, 174, 176
Coxe, erroneous account of Cilly's death, i. 88, *note*.
Cracow, Republic of, iv. 196; incorporated with Austria, 628
Cranach, Lucas, i. 393
Cranmer, i. 553 sq.
Crémieux, iv. 623
Créqui, Marshal, iii. 99, 126, 134 sq., 154
Crespy, Peace of, i. 609
Crillon, Duke de, iii. 536 sq.
Crim Girai, iii. 459
Crimea, Tartars of the, iii. 459; Russians penetrate into, *ib.*
Cristofero Moro, doge, i. 94
Cromwell, i. 582; lord protector, iii. 16; favoured by Spain, 18; foreign policy, 21; treaties with Sweden, Portugal, &c., 22; demands on Spain, 23; aids the Vaudois, 24; treaties with France,

CROMWELL
24; compels Mazarine to besiege Dunkirk, 25; death, 33; refuses to partition Denmark, 56
Cromwell, Richard, iii. 33
Crown, treaty of the, iii. 177
Cuesta, General, iv. 496
Cujavia, Bishop of, iii. 232, 237
Cumberland, Duke of, iii. 370, 382 sqq., 409 sqq.
Curia, Roman, i. 38; reformed, ii. 393
Cusanus (or Krebs), Nicholas, i. 331, 337
Custine, General, iv. 116 sq., 145, 146
Cyprus, taken by the Turks, ii. 193
Czarnecki, iii. 45, 54 sqq., 61
Czartoriski, iii. 448 sqq.; iv. 183, 528, 600

DALBERG, Baron, iv. 415
Dalrymple, Sir Hew, iv. 474
Damas, Roger de, iv. 313, 341, 412
Damiens, iii. 407
Dampierre, General, iv. 145
Damville, Marshal, ii. 273; becomes general of the Hugonots, 275; abandons them, 282; becomes Duke of Montmorenci, 334. (*See* Montmorenci.)
Danby, iii. 101
Danican, General, iv. 231
Danton, iv. 91, 98; description, 104; demands domiciliary visits, 107; atrocious circular, 110; chief instigator of the massacres, 111; motion respecting the King, 121; at Dumouriez's camp, 134; in the Committee of Public Welfare, 137; supports Robespierre against the atheists, 156; inclines to the *parti de la clémence*, 164; guillotined, 167
Darmstadt, Prince of, iii. 187, 189; killed, 190
Dashkoff, Princess, iii. 444
Davenant, ii. 482
David, iv. 148, 210
Davidovich, General, iv. 254 sq.
Davoust, Marshal, iv. 303, 376, 393, 423, 429, 507, 514, 557
Daubenton, Père, iii. 294, 308
Daun, Marshal, iii. 410 sqq.; 435 sq.
Daunou, iv. 229
Dauphiné, how held, i. 73; united to French crown, i. 113
Deane, Silas, iii. 523
Debry, iv. 307, 319
Decamisados, iv. 568
Decretals, false, i. 324
Decretum Alberti Regis, i. 33
Delaware, Lord, iii. 277
Del Giudice, Cardinal, iii. 295
Demetrius, Greek despot, i. 76; dies in a convent, 77
—, the false, ii. 395
Denmark, Reformation introduced, ii. 512; revolution in, iii. 118; crown hereditary, 119; colonies, 283; war with England, iv. 440
Desaix, General, 285, 303, 330 sqq.
Descartes, René, ii. 494 *note*; iii. 36
Descazes, iv. 504 sq.
Desèze, iv. 120
Desmoulins, Camille, iv. 48, 53, 65, 79, 104, 164, 167
Devereux, Captain, ii. 582 sqq.
Diamond necklace, affair of the, iii. 541
Diana of Poitiers, i. 438; ii. 57 sq.
Diaz, Bartholomew, i. 313
—, John, ii. 33
Diderot, iv. 22, 25

DIEBITSCH
Diebitsch, General, iv. 524; 600 sq.
Diet, German, i. 26; decline, iii. 264
Diplomacy, duplicity of, ii. 31
Directory, French, iv. 229; suspicious of Bonaparte, 223; bad faith of, 259; American negociations, 298; treatment of Hanse Towns, Portugal, &c., *ib.*; attempt on Ireland, 305; despotism, 315; war with Austria, 317
Divan, composition and proceedings of, i. 11; on horseback, 12
Dobran, treaty of, iii. 123
Doctrinaires, the, iv. 587
Doge, Venetian, i. 43
Dohna, Count, iii. 418
Dolet, Stephen, burnt, i. 615
Dolgorouki, iii. 469
Dombrowski, iv. 193, 194
Dominicans, their origin, i. 325
Dominico Soto, iii. 270
Donatello, i. 103
Donauwörth, troubles of, ii. 448; seized by Bavaria, 449
Doria, Andrea, i. 488 sq., 492, 551, 574 sqq., 604; ii. 62, 84, 100
—, Giannetino, ii. 63
Dorislaus, Dr., iii. 18
Dort, Synod of, ii. 479
Douza, Johannes, ii. 259
Draghut, Corsair, ii. 84, 100, 189
Dragonnades, iii. 139
Drake, Sir Francis, ii. 327 sqq.
— Mr., iv. 377
Drakul, voyvode of Wallachia, i. 18
Drotningholm, alliance of, iv. 83, 199
Drouet, iv. 76, 149
Drouyn de Lhuys, iv. 627
Dubois, Cardinal, iii. 296, 297, 304 sqq
Duché-pairie, la, ii. 412
Duckworth, Admiral, iv. 306, 445
Ducos, Roger, iv. 322, 331 sqq.
Dudley, Lord Guilford, ii. 105
Duelling, French, ii. 413
Dugommier, General, iv. 158, 222
Dumouriez, General, iii. 457; foreign minister, iv. 87; campaign in Belgium, 89 sq.; resigns, 90; commander-in-chief, 107; occupies the Argonne, 112; negociations with Brunswick, 113; at Jemappes, 116; campaign in Holland, 133 sqq.; threatens the Convention, 134; defeated by Coburg, *ib.*; arrests the commissaries of the Convention, 135; flight, *ib.*
Duncan, Admiral, iv. 284
Dundas, Admiral, iv. 657
Dunois, i. 125
Duphot, General, iv. 288
Dupleix, iii. 282
Dupont de l'Eure, iv. 591, 603, 623 sqq.
— de Nemours, iv. 271 sq.
Duport, iii. 545; iv. 64, 73 sqq.
Duprat, Antony, Chancellor of France, i. 351, 411
Dürer, Albert, i. 393
Dutch Republic, ii. 252; declaration of independence, 310; complain of Leicester, 323; commercial prosperity, 419 sq.; defeat the Spaniards at Gibraltar, 438; independence recognised, 440; colonial war with Portugal, iii. 66; sail up the Thames, 74; elation, 80; heroic defence, 90; aided by Spain and Austria, 95; colonies, 274 sq.; support Maria Theresa, 351; attacked by Joseph, ii. 478; treaty with France, *ib.*; civil dissensions, 479; Act of Mutual

ELIZABETH
Guarantee, 482; war with England, 534

EAST India Company, ii. 419
Eboli, Princess, ii. 307, 332
Eck. Dr., i. 388 sqq., 500, 539, 590
Economistes, iv. 13 sq.
Edgeworth, Abbé, iv. 122
Edict of Romorantin, ii. 142; of Orleans, 151; of July, 153; of Toleration, 155; of Amboise, 167; of Longjumeau, 181; of Nemours, 297; Perpetual, 299; abolished, iii. 91; of Union, ii. 339; of Nantes, 366; revoked, iii. 140; of Restitution, ii. 555
Edward IV., of England, treaty with Burgundy, i. 127; relations with Warwick, 132; imprisoned, 133; dethroned, 135; recovers his crown, 136; joins league against Louis XI., 138; invades France, 145; concludes Peace of Pecquigny, *ib.*
— VI., accession, ii. 54; projected marriage with Mary Queen of Scots, 77; with Henry II.'s daughter Elizabeth, 83; death, 103
Egmont, Count, ii. 104, 123, 224 sqq., arraigned 248; beheaded, 249
Egypt, conquered by Selim I., ii. 20
Einsiedeln, treaty of, i. 31
— monastery, i. 401
Ejalet, what, i. 12
El Arisch, Convention of, iv. 353
Elba, annexed to France, iv. 342
Eleanor, sister of Charles V., i. 462; marries Francis I., 496
— or Leonora, Queen of Navarre, i. 187
Electors, imperial, how qualified, i. 23; increased, iv. 366
Elizabeth, Queen, accession, ii. 128; treaty with Condé and the Hugonots, 162; war with France, 167; Popish plots against, 196 sqq.; deposed by Pius V., 197; proposed marriage with Duke of Anjou, 199; her abhorrence of the St. Bartholomew, 219; assists the Netherlanders, 252; they offer her the sovereignty of Holland and Zealand, 261; godmother to Charles IX.'s daughter, 269; treaty with Netherlanders, 301; courted by Anjou, 312; again declines the government of the Netherlands, *ib.*; marriage contract, *ib.* and *note*; declaration to aid the Dutch, 320; French conspiracy against, 326; deceived by Philip II. and Parma, 328; attacks Spain, 329; assists Henry of Navarre, 334; succours Henry IV., 348; further negociations, 370, 373; treats with the Porte, 383; persecuted the Catholics, 397; interview with Sully, 435; death, *ib.*
—, daughter of James I., marries the Elector Palatine, ii. 482; her ambition, 489
— Farnese, marries Philip V., iii. 294; her character, *ib.*; violent policy, 313
— of Hungary, i. 32; flies to Vienna, 35
— Petrowna, iii. 362, 363; seizes the Russian sceptre, 364; alliance with England, 365, 397; peace with Sweden, 366; joins Maria Theresa, 398, 406; death, 433

Elliot, General, iii. 537
—, Sir Gilbert, iv. 158
Emanuel the Great of Portugal, discoveries and conquests under, i. 313; ii. 285
— Philibert, Duke of Savoy, ii. 102, 122 sqq.
Emêri, iii. 4
Emigration, French, iv. 52
Emperor, German, titles and prerogatives, i. 20 sq.
Encyclopædists, French, iv. 22
Enghien, d', Duke, at Rocroi, ii. 615; further victories, 616 sqq., 633; iv. 377; murdered, 378. (*See* Condé.)
England, subordinate position of, before Henry V., i. 68; plan to partition, 580; progress of trade in, ii. 25; returns to Roman Catholicism, 106; position in Europe, iii. 266, 268 sq.; colonies, 275 sq.
Enragés, iv. 164
Ensenada, Marquis de la, iii. 423, 424
Entragues, d', Madlle., ii. 428
Épernon, d', Duke, ii. 365, 457 sq.
Eprémesnil, D', iii. 545
Erasmus, i. 338, 393, 395; writings condemned in Spain, ii. 12
Erastianism, ii. 478
Eric of Denmark, ii. 506 sq.
— IV. of Sweden, ii. 516; war with his brothers, *ib.*; imprisoned and murdered, 517
Ericson, Gustavus, ii. 509. (*See* Vasa, Gustavus.)
Erlach, Von, ii. 599
Ernest, Archibald, governor of Netherlands, ii. 332, 368; death, 369
— Augustus, Duke of Cumberland, becomes King of Hanover, iv. 628
Erotes, d', Baron, iv. 568
Escoiquiz, Canon, iv. 459, 467
Escovedo, ii. 332
Escurial, foundation of, ii. 123
Espartero, General, iv. 617 sq.; "Duke of Victory," 618; Regent, *ib.*; flies to England, *ib.*; returns to Spain, 654
Essex, Earl of, ii. 371, 372
Estaing, d', Admiral, iii. 527, 529
Estatuto Real (Spanish Constitution), iv. 613
Esterhazy, Prince, iv. 663
Estrades, D', iii. 17, 99
Estrées d', Cardinal, iii. 148
— d', Marshal, iii. 409
Etampes, Duchess d', ii. 57
Étaples, treaty, i. 172
États Généraux, (1560), ii. 150 (1561), 153; (1788), iii. 546
Etruria, kingdom of, iv. 341
Eugène, of, Savoy, Prince, iii. 115; defeats the Turks at Zenta, *ib.*; at Staffarda, 155; at Marsaglia, 158; advises Leopold to make war, 177; successful campaign, 178; campaign of 1702, 181; President of the Council of War, 184; joins Marlborough, 185; defeated at Cassano, 189; campaign of 1706, 191; defeated by Villars, 203, 207; war against the Turks, 302; takes Belgrade, 303; on the Rhine, 323
— Beauharnais, Viceroy, iv. 483; in Russia, 514; conducts the retreat of the Grand Army, 529; defeated in Italy, 538 sq.; Italian campaign 1814, 549; evacuates Italy, 550
Eugenia Montejo, marries Napoleon III., iv. 652
Eugenius II., Pope, promotes a war against the Turks, i. 16
— IV., Pope, grant to the Portuguese, i. 312
Europe, condition of, after peace of Câteau-Cambrésis, ii. 134
European System, its rise, &c., i. 307; iii. 268
Exaltados, iv. 569
"Excellence," title of, ii. 625
Eyck, John van, i. 67
Eyzinger leads a revolt against Frederick III., i. 83; expels Count Cilly, *ib.*

FABER, Peter, ii. 10
Fabre d'Eglantine, iv. 30, 104, 167
Fabricius, ii. 485
Faith, justification by, ii. 5
Falkenskiold, iii. 492, 494
"Family Compact," iii. 371, 429
Farel, i. 563, 613
Fargis, Du, ii. 536 sq.
Farinelli, iii. 423, 426
Farnese, House of, at Parma, i. 618
—, Alex., ii. 195, 234, 301; governor of Netherlands, 303; treaty with Walloons, 306; military successes, 315; procures the assassination of Orange, 316; becomes Duke of Parma, 321; preparations against England, 327 sq.; campaigns 1588, 1589, 330; advance on Paris, 351; relieves Rouen, 355; escapes from Caudebec, *ib.*; death, 356 (cf. 332)
—, Ottavio, ii. 79, 84, 119; 225
—, Peter Louis, Duke of Camerino, i. 575; ii. 62; assassinated, 167
—, Cardinal, i. 558. (*See* Paul III.)
Fauconberg, Lord, iii. 26
Faur, Du, speech, ii. 137
Favras, Marquis de, iv. 69
Federation, Fête of the, iv. 70 sq., 95
Fehden, or private wars, i. 25
Fénélon, Archbishop, iii. 202, 290
Feodor III., Czar, iii. 111, *note*.
Ferdinand I., Emperor, i. 497, marries Anne, sister of Louis, King of Hungary and Bohemia, 516; elected King of Bohemia, 521; of Hungary, 522; enters Buda, 523; crowned, *ib.*; offers tribute to Solyman I., 524; besieges John Zapolya in Buda, 526; elected King of the Romans, 543; peace with Solyman, 552; negociations with the Porte, 593; his army defeated by the Turks, 594; peace with Zapolya, *ib.*; offers tribute for Hungary, 595; reduces and punishes the rebellious Bohemians, ii. 52 sq.; consents to the assassination of Martinuzzi, 97; becomes Emperor, 114; relinquishes Metz, Toul, and Verdun, 129; as King of Hungary and Bohemia, 168; truce with the Porte, *ib.*; introduces the Jesuits into Germany, 169; relations to Council of Trent, 173; death and testament, *ib.*
— II., Emperor, ii. 488; persecutions in Bohemia, 498; cancels the *Majestäts Brief*, 499; his bigotry, 552; reactionary plans, 553; publishes the Edict of Restitution, 555; convenes a Diet at Ratisbon, 557; dismisses Wallenstein, 558; invests the Duke of Nevers with Mantua, 562; recalls Wallenstein, 569; decrees his destruction, 580; examination of Ferdinand's conduct, 583; rewards Wallenstein's murderers, 584; death, 595
Ferdinand III., Emperor, ii. 595; nearly captured at Ratisbon, 609; his losses, 625; disinclined to peace, *ib.*; assists Spain, iii. 16; mediates between the Russians and Poles, 52; death, 27, and *note*.
— I. of Austria, iv. 628; crowned in Hungary, 629; grants a Constitution, 632; crowned at Milan, 635; flies to Innsbrück, 638; returns to Vienna, 641; flies to Olmütz, 642; abdicates, *ib.*
— of Aragon, marriage, i. 181; made heir to the crown, 183; accession, 187; takes Granada, 191; the "Catholic," 211; treaty with Louis XII. to divide Naples, 232; his treachery and hypocrisy, 233; further treaty with Louis, 236; visits Naples, 244; Regent of Castile, 247; marries Germaine de Foix, 249; resigns Castile to Philip and Joanna, 251; second visit to Naples, 253; interview with Louis XII., 254; assumes the government of Castile, 255; conduct in the League of Cambray, 267; seizes Navarre, 296; defrauds Columbus, 323; death, 360; will, 363
— VI. of Spain, iii. 385; declines the French alliance, 408; death, 423
— VII. of Spain, family dissensions as Prince of Asturias, iv. 459; writes to Napoleon, 460; arrested, 461; baseness, *ib.*; assumes the royal title, 464; abdicates, 469; carried to Valençay, 470; returns to Spain, 541; accedes to Peace of Paris, 548; bigotry, 566; his *Camarilla*, *ib.*; carried to Seville, 569; delivered by the French, 570; returns to Madrid, 571; acknowledges Louis Philippe, 603; wives, 612; marries Maria Christina of Naples, *ib.*; publishes a Pragmatic Sanction, *ib.*; death, 613
— I., King of Naples, i. 99; the barons rebel against him, 100; offer the crown to John of Anjou, *ib.*; supports Pius VI., 109; forms a league with Lorenzo de' Medici, 110
— II. of Naples, i. 211; flies to Sicily on the invasion of Charles VIII., 212; recovers his dominions, 217; dies, 218
— IV. of Naples, iii. 426; marriage, 471; alliance with Great Britain, iv. 206; peace with France, 245; negociations with Directory, 311; treaty with Austria, *ib.*; alliance with England and Russia, 313; invades the Roman States, *ib.*; returns to Naples, 325; convention with France, 395; joins the Coalition, 410; flies to Sicily, 411; resigns, 491; returns to Naples, 555; assumes the title of Ferdinand I., King of the Two Sicilies, 607. (*See* Ferdinand I.)
— I., "King of the Two Sicilies," concordat with Pius VII., iv. 573; abandons the government, 574; death, 607
— II., King of the Two Sicilies, iv. 607; grants a Constitution, 636; another, 639

FERDINAND

Ferdinand, Cardinal-Infant, ii. 585, 607
—, Grand Duke of Tuscany, iii. 505; iv. 223
— of Styria, Archduke, i. 448, 483; succeeds Matthias in Bohemia and Hungary, 484; accedes to the Austrian dominions, 486. (*See* Ferdinand II.)
—, Archduke, iv. 483
—, Maria, Elector of Bavaria, iii. 29
— of Coburg, marries the Queen of Portugal, iv. 616
Feria, Duke of, ii. 358 sq.
Ferrara, Council of, i. 331
Fersen, Count, iv. 505
Fesch, Cardinal, iv. 381, 415, 456
Fetwa, what, i. 13
Feudalism, decline of, i. 299; survival in Germany, 300; in France, iv. 7
Feuillant, party and club, iv. 78, 89
Fickquelmont, Count, iv. 637
Fiesco, conspiracy of, ii. 63
Fieschi, iv. 605
Filangieri, Prince, iv. 646
Finland united with Russia, iv. 448
Firmans, what, i. 9
Fitz-James, Duke, iv. 587, 604
Flaccius, Matthias, ii. 73
Flagellants, the, ii. 274, 295
Fleix, treaty of, ii. 284
Flemming, General, iii. 220
Flesselles, De, iv. 50
Fleurances, i. 344
Fleuri, Cardinal, iii. 312, 319, 324, 353, 367
—, Abbé, iii. 308
Fleuriot, Lescot, iv. 166, 172
Florence, state of, i. 45; a Guelf city, 48
—, insurrection at, 103
—, subjugation of, 528
Florentines, secretly aid the Turks, i. 94; submit to the Pope, 111
Florida Blanca, iii. 516, 527 sq.; iv. 476
Foix, John de, claims the crown of Navarre, i. 294
Folembrai, treaty of, ii. 364
Foligno, armistice, iv. 341
Fonseca, Antonio de, i. 403
Fontainebleau, treaty, iii. 127; (1743), 371; (1785), 478; (1808), iv. 453; adieus of, 546
Fontanges, Archbishop of Toulouse, iv. 70
Fontenelle, iv. 16
Formula of Concord, Saxon, ii. 451
Foscari, Doge, i. 43, 81
Fouché, iv. 154, 158, 159, 169, 170, 322, 331, 554
Foulon, murder of, iv. 52
Fouquier Tinville, iv. 151, 171, 212
Fournier, iv. 109
Fox, Charles, iii. 506; iv. 127, 408
Foy, General, iv. 579
Fra Diavolo, iv. 412 sq.
France, early history, i. 63; English expelled, 68; misery of, 69; standing army, 70; settlements in America, ii. 14; trade, 24; bad commercial system, 409; maritime commerce, 422; exhaustion under Louis XIV., iii. 159; state after civil wars, 264 sq.; rivalry with Austria, 267; with England 269; colonies, 275, 279 sq.; increasing distress, 519, despotism of the monarchy, iv. 9
Franche Comté, annexed to France, iii. 97

FRANCIS

Francis I., Emperor, iii. 382; opposed to the French alliance, 400; death, 471; character, *ib.*
— II., Emperor, iii. 505; adheres to the Prussian Alliance, iv. 88; coronation, 94; relinquishes claims on Bavaria, 162; seizes Galicia, 192; letter to Bonaparte, 277; alliance with England, 339; signs Peace of Lunéville, 340; assumes the title of Emperor of Austria, 393; secret convention with Russia, 386; joins Third Coalition, 392; interview with Napoleon, 405; resigns the imperial crown of Germany, 417; adopts the Continental System, 443; warlike preparations, 479; manifesto, 480; treaty to assist Napoleon, 509; at Dresden, 512; joins the Coalition, 533; at Leipsic, 535; restored in Lombardy, 550; laxity of his government, 576; death, 628
— Joseph I. of Austria, iv. 612; abrogates the Constitution, 653; interview with the Czar, 657
— I. of France, marries Claude i. 254, 347; accession, 350; invades Italy, 353; obtains Milan, 356; treaty and interview with Leo X., 557; concordat with Leo, 358; treaty with Henry VIII., 373; a candidate for imperial crown, 374; jealousy of Charles V., 406; invades Navarre, *ib.*; excommunicated, 413; abandons Italy, 421; league against, 431; attacked by Henry VIII. and Charles V., 435; expedition to Italy, 443; despatches part of his army to Naples, 444; captured at Marignano, 447; concessions to recover his liberty, 457; carried to Spain, 458; prisoner at Madrid, 459; resigns but retracts, 461; signs treaty of Madrid, 462; predetermined violation of it, 463; returns to France, 464; refuses to ratify the treaty of Madrid, 465; joins the Clementine League, 468; engages to marry Princess Mary, 471; treaty with Henry VIII., 486; makes the Peace of Cambray, 494; deserts his allies, 495; marries Eleanor, sister of Charles V., 496; refuses aid to the Emperor, 548; treaty with John Zapolya, *ib.*; relations with the Porte, 549; protectorate of eastern Christians, *ib.*; treaty with Henry VIII., 552; intrigues with German princes, 559; invades Savoy, 563; persecutes the Protestants, 570; invites Melanchthon to Paris, 572; treaty with the Porte, 573; meets Charles at Nice, 575; at Aigue Mortes, 578; persecutes the Reformers, 579; altered policy towards England, *ib.*; claims Guelderland, 581; his ambassadors murdered, 597; war with Charles V., 598; Peace of Crespy, 608; persecutes the Vaudois, 613; burns Dolet and others, 615; expedition against England, 616; religious persecutions, ii. 55; death, *ib.*; profligacy in his reign, 56 and *note*
— II. of France, marries Mary, Queen of Scots, ii. 126; accession, 138; evacuates Scotland, 142; cites the King of Navarre and Condé to court, 143; death, 149

FREDERICK

Francis Stephen, Duke of Lorraine, iii. 322; obtains Tuscany, 324; retains Falkenstein, *ib.*; marries Maria Theresa, 325; commander-in-chief, 333; enters Bohemia, 356; declares Tuscany neutral, 359; elected Emperor, 382. (*See* Francis I.)
Francis I. King of the Two Sicilies, iv. 607
— II., Duke of Brittany, i. 118; subdued, 166
Francis de Assis, iv. 619; marries Isabella, ii. 620
Francis de Victoria, iii. 270
Franciscans, their origin, i. 325
Francois de Neufchâteau, iv. 275
Francs Archers, i. 71
Frangipani, Count, iii. 103
Frankenberg, Cardinal, iii. 498, 499
Frankfort, union of, iii. 375; declaration of, iv. 537
Franklin, Dr., iii. 525
Frederick III., Emperor, i. 17, 18, 28; at Rome, 83; revolt against, *ib.*; disorganised state of Empire under, *ib.*; causes himself to be crowned king of Hungary, 90; gives up St. Stephen's crown. *ib.*; reunites Austria, *ib.*; disappoints the ambition of Charles the Bold, 142; proceeds against the Flemings, 167; pilgrimage to Rome, i. 194; driven from his dominions, 197; negociations with Matthias, 198; death, 200
— I. of Denmark, ii. 512; favours the Reformation, *ib.*; death, 514
— II. of Denmark, ii. 515; death, 517
— III. of Denmark, treaty with the Dutch, iii. 53; declares war against Charles X., *ib.*; alliance with John Casimir, 54; war with Sweden, 55; Peace of Roskild, 58; defence of Copenhagen, 60; aided by the Dutch, 61; and Brandenburgers, *ib.*; death, 123
— IV. of Denmark, iii. 129; alliance with Poland, 215; attacks Charles, i. 221; invades Holstein, *ib.*; concludes a peace, 223; alliance with Augustus II., 241; invades Sweden, *ib.*; defeated by Stenbock, 242; peace with Sweden, 254; attacked by Russia, 333; death, 360
— V. of Denmark, ii. 491
— VI. of Denmark, iv. 198; joins Armed Neutrality, 349; refuses to surrender Danish fleet, 439; seeks the Swedish crown, 505; cedes Norway to Sweden, 538; death, 629
— VII. of Denmark, iv. 630
— I. of Sweden, iii. 254; concludes peace with Russia, *ib.*; war with Russia, 353; his weakness, 360; death, 405
—, King of Naples, i. 218; offers to become tributary to France, 232; becomes Louis XII.'s captive, 234
— William of Brandenburg, the "Great Elector," ii. 610; league with the House of Austria, iii. 29; his politic character, 46; piety, *ib.*; alliance with the Dutch, 47; with the Prussian nobles against Charles X., *ib.*

FREDERICK
becomes vassal of Sweden, 48; alliance with Charles X., 49; obtains the sovereignty of Prussia, 52; confirmed by the treaty of Welau, 54; alliance with Denmark, 58; aids Frederick III., 61; rejects the offers of Louis XIV., and concludes an alliance with the Dutch, 85; advances to their aid, 94; peace with France, *ib.*; separates from his allies, 121; defeats the Swedes at Fehrbellen, 123; alliance with Denmark, *ib.*; invades Pomerania, 124; takes Stettin, &c., 125; courts Louis XIV., 126; signs two treaties with Louis XIV., 127 133; supports the Hugonots, 713; publishes a retaliatory edict against the revocation of that of Nantes, 142; treaty with Sweden, *ib.*; with the emperor, 145; death, 154; arbitrary policy, 263
Frederick III. of Brandenburg, iii. 154; becomes King of Prussia, iii. 177. (*See* Frederick I.)
— I. of Prussia, iii. 178; death, 242
— William I. of Prussia, iii. 242; takes Stralsund, 247; treaty with France, 250; treaty with Austria and Russia, 316; equivocal policy, 319; death, 340; character, 341
— II. of Prussia, iii. 340; increases his army, 343; discontent with the emperor, *ib.*; invades Silesia, 344; his pretended claims, 345; occupies Silesia, 346 sq.; treaty with France, 351; Convention of Klein Schnellendorf, 355; alliance with Saxony and Bavaria, 356; invades Moravia, 357; defeats the Austrians at Czaslau, *ib.*; Peace of Breslau, 358; alliance with France, 375; invades Bohemia, 376; deserted by the French, 377; invades Saxony, 381; makes peace, *ib.*; insulted by Rouillé, 399; treaty with England, *ib.*; invades Saxony, 402; enters Dresden, 403; master of Saxony, 404; treaty with England, *ib.*; denounced by the Diet, *ib.*; defeated at Kolin, iii. 411; his despondency, *ib.*; victorious at Rossbach, 413; at Leuthen, *ib.*; retreats through Bohemia, 417; victorious at Zorndorf, 418; defeated at Hochkirch, *ib.*; at Kunersdorf, 420; recovers Saxony, *ib.*; defeats Loudon, 422; and Daun, *ib.*; campaign of 1761, 431; treaty with the Porte, 432; peace with Russia and Sweden, 433; defeats the Austrians at Burkersdorf, 434; takes Schweidnitz, *ib.*; annoys the German princes, 438; Peace of Hubertsburg, 439; policy as to Poland, 449; interview with Joseph II., 461; treaty with Catherine II. about Poland, 464; declaration respecting Poland, 466; opposes Austria in the Bavarian succession, 473; concludes the treaty of Teschen, 474; organises the *Fürsten Bund*, *ib.*; death, 480; results of his reign, *ib.*; friendship for Voltaire, iv. 18
— William II. of Prussia, iii. 481; interferes in the affairs of Holland, *ib.*; treaty with England and the Dutch, 482; alliance with the Porte, 497; convention of Reichenbach, 503; zeal for Louis
FREDERICK
XVI., iv. 80; abandons his allies, 161; proceeds to Poland, 162; courts the Poles, 181 sq.; approves their new Constitution, 183; tergiversation, 185; bargain with Catherine II. about Poland, 186; seizes Dantzic, &c., 188; in Poland, 191; besieges Warsaw, 192; retreats, 193; breaks with the Coalition, 221; peace with the French republic, *ib.*; fatal results of his policy, 222; treaty with France, 249; sacrifices Germany, 250; death, 282
Frederick William III. of Prussia, iv. 282; courts the French Directory, *ib.*; resolves on neutrality, 308; recognises Napoleon as emperor, 383; offers to mediate between France and Russia, 386; persists in remaining neutral, 389; accedes to the Coalition, 402; but on condition of receiving Hanover, 403; hesitates to act, 404; ratifies a treaty dictated by Napoleon, 409; seizes Hanover, 410; project of a Northern Confederation, 419; anger at the prospect of losing Hanover, 420; resolves on war, 421; retreat, 424; prostration of his kingdom, 427; writes to Napoleon, *ib.*; at Tilsit, 431; humiliation, 433; courts Napoleon, 509; at Dresden, 512; deserts Napoleon, 524; at Gross Görschen, 530; at Leipsic, 535; enters Paris, 544; visits London, 548; death, 628
— — IV. of Prussia, promises a Constitution, iv. 628; ambitious designs, 632 sq.; attacks Denmark, 634, declines the title of emperor, 647; attempts to form a league, 653
Frederick of Hohenzollern, i. 27
— the Wise, Elector of Saxony, refuses the imperial crown, i. 376; protects Luther, 387; opinion of the Pope's Rose, 391; vicar of North Germany, 392; disapproves Luther's quitting the Wartburg, 499; death, 510
— Augustus of Saxony, iii. 316 sq.; proclaimed King of Poland, 319. (*See* Augustus III.)
— Augustus III. of Saxony named to Polish succession, iv. 183; becomes King of Saxony, 429; aids Napoleon against Russia, 514 sqq.; retires to Prague, 527; returns to his capital, 531; a prisoner at Berlin, 535; death, 601
— of Hesse-Cassel, marries Ulrica Eleanora of Sweden, iii. 253; receives the crown, 254. (*See* Frederick I.)
—, Landgrave of Hesse, iv. 629
— IV., Elector Palatine, Director of the Protestant Union, ii. 449, 461
— V., Elector Palatine, ii. 461, 462; marries Elizabeth, daughter of James I., 482; accepts the Bohemian crown, 490; the "Winter King," 492; defeated on the White Mountain, 497; flies to Breslau, *ib.*; deserted by the Union, 499; withdraws from the contest, 501; deprived of Upper Palatinate, *ib.*; joins Gustavus Adolphus, 567; death, 577
— Henry of Nassau, ii. 434 sq.; 545; stadtholder of Holland, &c., 546; successful campaigns, 587
—, Prince of Orange, iv. 695 sq.; defeats Niellon and Daine, 598
GEORGE
Frederick de Toledo, ii. 255, 256
Fregoso, Battista, i. 109
—, Cæsar, i. 488
—, Giano, doge of Genoa, i. 294
"French Fury," ii. 314
Frere, Mr., iv. 385
Eréron, iv. 65, 158, 169, 175, 210
Friso of Nassau, iii. 179
Fronde, the, iii. 4 sqq.; new, 9
Fructidor, 18th, iv. 274
Frunsberg, George von, i. 280, 398, 408, 420, 445, 465, 475, 477; death, 478
Fuensaldána, iii. 25
Fuentès, Count, ii. 368, 369
Fuggers, the, i. 543, *note*.
Funding system, origin, ii. 21
Fürstenberg, William von, iii. 96, 146
Fürsten Bund, or German League, 1785, iii. 474

GABELLE, iv. 11
Gabrielle d'Estrées, ii. 351, 365, 373, 427
Gaetano, legate, ii. 347, 350
Gage, General, iii. 522 sq.
Gagern, Heinirich von, iv. 640
Gages, General, iii. 332 sqq.
Galata. (*See* Pera.)
Gallas, General, ii. 579, 608 sqq.
Galliani, Abbé, iv. 22
Gallican Church, condition in 17th century, ii. 397
Galway, Lord, iii. 190, 193
Gambier, Admiral, iv. 439
Gamblours, battle, ii. 302
Ganganelli. (*See* Clement XIV.)
Garat, iv. 122, 311 sq.
Garcilasso de la Vega, i. 566
Gardie, De la, ii. 520 sq.; iii. 45 sqq.; 120 sqq.
Gardiner, Bishop, i. 490
Garibaldi, iv. 638, 640, 645 sq.
Gaston, Duke of Anjou, ii. 538; marries Margaret of Lorraine, 587; conspires against Richelieu, 611 sq.; takes part in the *Fronde*, iii. 5; changes sides, 10; Lieut. General, 14; retires, *ib.*
Gaston de Foix, i. 280 sqq.; death, 290
Gates, General, iii. 525, 529
Gattinara, Chancellor of Charles V., i. 411; ii. 131
Gennadius, i. 75
Genoese, at Constantinople, i. 14; colonies and commerce, i. 44; transfer their colonies to the *Casa di S. Giorgio*, i. 82; submit to Charles VII., 115; reduced by French, 488; expel the French, 492; humiliated by Louis XIV., iii. 135 sq.; adhere to France, iv. 247
Gensonné, iv. 84 sqq.; 142 sqq.
Gentili Alberico, iii. 271
George I., of England, iii. 208, 209; joins the Alliance against Sweden, 247: treaty with Sweden, 253; with Holland, 299; with Prussia, 311; prepares for war, 312; death, *ib.*
— II., iii. 313; alliance with Maria Theresa, 351; concludes a treaty of neutrality, 353; accedes to Peace of Breslau, 358; alliance with Prussia and Holland, *ib.*; heads his army, 369; at Dettingen, 370; joins the Quadruple Alliance, 378; treaties with Austria and Russia, 389; calls on Maria Theresa to increase her army, 397; demands the aid of Holland, 400; repu-

GEORGE

diates the Convention of Kloster Seven, 414; subsidises Frederick II., *ib.*; death, 423
George III., iii. 427; Peace of Paris, 438; alliance with Prussia and Holland, 482; American Revolution, 522; war with France, 526; message to Parliament, iv. 371; war with Prussia, 410; with America, 527; treaties with Russia and Prussia, 532; assumes the title of "King of Hanover," 552; death, 578
— IV., accession, iv. 578; death, 593
—, Duke of Saxony, i. 392 sqq., 500 sqq., 588; death, 589
— William, Elector of Brandenburg, ii. 494, 551, 564, 609
Geraldine, ii. 289
Geraldino, Major, ii. 582
Gérard, Balthazar, ii. 316
—, Marshal, iv. 598
Germany, Papal power in, i. 332; peasant war, 506; divided into circles, 257; dissolution of Empire, iv. 415 sqq.; disturbances, 577, 630 sq.; German Constitution, 640; further disorders, 647, 652
Gerona, captured, iv. 497
Gerson, i. 329
Gertruydenberg, conference at, iii. 197
Ghent, revolt of, i. 584; punished, 586; insurrection at, ii. 304
Giano della Bella, i. 46
Gibbon, Edward, iii. 528
Gibraltar, captured by Admiral Rooke, iii. 187
Gioja, Flavio, i. 310
Girardin, M., iv. 622
Giron, don Pedro de, i. 404
Girondists, their pedantry, iv. 40; in the legislative Assembly, 84; in the ministry, 87; force the King to declare war, 89; denounce an Austrian Committee, *ib.*; attempt to overawe the King, 97; restored to power, 104; connived at the massacres, 111; in the Convention, 113; attack the Mountain, 115; demand a guard, 116; arrested, 142; execution of, 152
Gneisenau, General, iv. 525
Gobel, Bishop, iv. 154, 168
Godolphin, iii. 199
Godoy, Don Em., iv. 130; "Prince of the Peace," 227, 256, 299, 300, 451, 462 sq.
Goethe, iv. 202
Gohier, iv. 322 sqq.
Golden Bull, i. 24
Gomarists, ii. 478
Gondi, family of, iii. 6
—, Count de Retz, ii. 181, 208
—, Francis Paul de, iii. 5. (*See* Retz, Cardinal de.)
Gonfalonier, Florentine, i. 46
Gonsalvo of Cordova, i. 191; 217 sq., 233 sqq., 253 sqq., 290; death, 361
Gonzaga, Ferdinand, i. 618; ii. 67, 79 sqq.
Gonzales de Cordova, ii. 500, 588
Gorcum, treaty of, i. 581
Gordon, Colonel, ii. 581 sqq.
—, General Patrick, iii. 216
Görgey, General, iv. 642 sq.
Gorsas, iv. 65
Görtz, Baron, iii. 249 sqq.; 481
Gortschakoff, Prince, iv. 657, 661 sq.
Gorzyca Confederation of, iii. 248
Gosnold, Bartholomew, iii. 277

GOTZ

Götz von Berlichingen, i. 301, 508
Gower, Lord, iv. 123
Graham, Sir Thos., iv. 498 sqq., 540
Grammont, Marshal, iii. 28, 33
—, Duke of, 370
Grand Privilege (Dutch), i. 152
Grandees, Spanish, i. 583
Granier de Cassagnac, M., iv. 32
Granvella, Perrenot de, i. 493, 527, 590; ii. 70; death, 83; influence with Charles V., 132
—, Bishop of Arras, ii. 83, 126, 145, 226 sqq., 245, 307
Grasse, Count de, iii. 536 sq.
Gratiani, Caspar, ii. 503
Gravamina, centum, i. 504
Greeks, insurrection of, iii. 460; state of, iv. 580
Grégoire, Abbé, iv. 114
Gregorian Calendar, ii. 324
Gregory XIII., Pope, ii. 205; founds the Jesuits' College at Rome, *ib.*; celebrates the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 219; offers Henry III. money against the Hugonots, 282; plots against Queen Elizabeth, 289, approves the French League, 296; death, 324; his calendar, &c., *ib.*
— XIV., Pope, renews excommunication of Henry IV., ii. 352; aids the League, 353; death, 356
— XV., Pope, establishes the *Propaganda*, ii. 402, 523; death, 528
— XVI., Pope, iv. 605; promises reform, 606; death, 635
Gremonville, iii. 83
Grenville, Lord, iii. 506; iv. 126 sqq., 257, 311, 336, 348, 408
—, Thos., iv. 217
Grey, Lady Jane, ii. 105
Grimaldi, minister of Charles III., iii. 507
Grimm, Baron, iv. 22
Gritti, Aloysio, i. 593
Grodno, Diet of, iv. 188
Grotius, Hugo, ii. 473 sq.; Swedish ambassador at Paris, 589; as international jurist, iii. 271
Groyne, the (Corunna), expedition to, ii. 230
Grumsbach, William of, ii. 264
Guadet, iv. 84, 88, 97, 142
Guard, National, instituted, iv. 49
Guastalla, Cæsar, Duke of, ii. 559
Guasto, Marquis del, i. 473, 597, 604 sqq.
Guébriant, Marshal, ii. 608, 610, 611
Guelderland, Charles, Duke of, i. 365
Guelfs and Ghibelins, i. 48
Guerilla warfare, iv. 473
Guernon de Ranville, iv. 589, 603
Guerre du Bien Public, i. 122; *folle*, i. 163; *des amoureux*, ii. 284
Gueux, the, ii. 236; *Sauvages*, 246; *de la Mer*, 251
Guicciardini, i. 410, 416
Guienne, annexed to France, i. 138; revolt in, ii. 74
Guillotine, the, iv. 106
Guiot de Provins, i. 310
Guise, family of, ii. 58; policy respecting Scotland, 77; supreme in France, 124, 138; plot against the Protestants, 143; against Queen Elizabeth, 291
—, Anthony, Duke of, i. 509
—, Claude, Duke of, i. 598
—, Francis, Duke of, defends Metz, ii. 99; invades Italy, 119; at Rome, 120; abused by the Pope,

GYLLENBORG

121; lieutenant-general of France, 124; takes Calais, 125; campaign in Flanders, 127; commander-in-chief, 139; at Fontainebleau, 143; forms the *Triumvirate*, 152; attacks the Hugonots at Vassy, 158; enters Paris, *ib.*; brings the King and his mother thither, 159; assassinated, 165
Guise, Henry, Duke of (*Balafré*), ii. 179, 200, 207, 277; discontent, 280; aims at the crown, 294; popularity, 295; treaty with Philip II., *ib.*; designs on England, 329; campaign against Hugonots, 334; defeats the Germans, 337; enters Paris, *ib.*; haughty demands, 338; master of Paris, 339; assassinated, 341
—, Charles, Duke of, ii. 354; submits to Henry IV., 362
—, Henry II., Duke of, ii. 630 sq.
—, Cardinal, ii. 124, 341
—, Mary of, Queen of Scotland, ii. 78; death, 142
Guiton, mayor of Rochelle, ii. 543
Guizot, M., leader of the *Doctrinaires*, iv. 586; minister, 591, 603, 605; leads *centre droit*, 608; reactionary policy, 620
Guldberg, iii. 493, 494
Gunpowder invented, *i.* 302
Guns, invention of, i. 303
Gusman, Donna Luisa de, Regent of Portugal, iii. 66
Gustavus I. of Sweden, introduces the Reformation, ii. 512; insurrection against, 514; death, 515
— Adolphus, of Sweden, ii. 506, 519; accession and character, 520; war with Russia, 521; with Poland, *ib.*; marriage, *ib.*; aids Stralsund, 554; treaty with France, 556; lands at Usedom, 557; progress in North Germany, 563; threatens Berlin, 564; treaty with Elector of Brandenburg, *ib.*; defeats Tilly at Leipsic, 565; march to the Rhine, 566; joined by the Elector Palatine, 567; declines to see Louis XIII., 568; invades Bavaria, 569; enters Augsburg and Munich, 570; occupies Nuremberg, 571; proposes peace to Wallenstein, 572; nature of his troops, *ib.*; at Erfurt, *ib.*; killed at Lützen, 574; character, 575
— III. of Sweden, iii. 488; effects a revolution, 489; attacks Russia, 490; makes himself absolute, 495; blockaded at Wiborg, *ib.*; peace with Russia, 496; hatred of French Revolution, iv. 80, 198; conspiracy against, 199; assassinated, 200
— IV., Adolphus, of Sweden, iv. 200; visits St. Petersburg, *ib.*; joins the Armed Neutrality, 348; protests against the murder of the Duke d'Enghien, 383; treaty with England, 387; resigns the command of allied army, 462; hatred of Napoleon, 440; evacuates Stralsund, 442; treaty with England, 447; imprisons the Russian ambassador, *ib.*; abdication, 449
Guyon, Madame, iii. 290
Guzman, Donna Luisa de, iii. 605
Gyllenborg, Count, iii. 361, 362

HABSBURG

HABSBURG, House of, i. 27 sqq.; strengthened by the Reformation, iii. 262
Habsburg-Lorraine, House of, iii. 382
Haddick, General, iii. 411
Haddock, Admiral, iii. 359
Hague, First Convention of the, iii. 62; *do.* 1748, 389
Hakluyt, Richard, iii. 277
Hamilton, Regent, i. 616
—, Sir William, iv. 206, 312
—, Lady, iv. 312
Hanover, made an Electorate, iii. 117; a Kingdom, iv. 522
Hansa, the, i. 26; ii. 22
Hanse Towns, decline of, ii. 420
Harburn, William, ii. 382
Harcourt, Count d', iii. 8, 12, 168
Hardy, Admiral, iii. 528
Hardenberg, Prince, iv. 204, 225, 385, 393; State Chancellor, 509, 524
Harlai, President, ii. 465
Harley, Earl of Oxford, iii. 199
Haro, Don Louis de, iii. 32
Haroudji Barbarossa, i. 364
Harrach, Count, iii. 168, 176
Harrington, Earl of, iii. 380
Hassan Aga, i. 593
Hassenpflug, iv. 653
Hats and *Nightcaps*, iii. 361, 405, 488
Hattischerifs, what, i. 9
Hatzfeld, General, ii. 600, 608
Haugwitz, iv. 204, 221, 250, 282, 402, 406, 409, 421
Hawke, Admiral, iii. 388, 394, 417, 421
Hawkesbury, Lord, iv. 355, 370, 374
Haynau, Count, iv. 643, 644
Hébert, iv. 65, 100, 139, 151, 165, 166
Hébertistes, iv. 164 sqq.
Heidelberg, destroyed by the French, iii. 153
Heilbronn, Union of, ii. 577
Heinsius, Daniel, Grand Pensionary, iii. 179; his policy, 180, 192
Held, Chancellor, i. 588
Heligoland, ceded to England, iv. 538
Helvetic Republic, iv. 295 sq.; Act of Mediation, 367
Helvétius, iv. 22, 23
Henries, War of the Three, ii. 335
Henrietta, sister of Louis XIII., ii. 526; marries Charles I., 530; reception in England, 532; procession to Tyburn, 539; advice to Anne of Austria, iii. 6
Henriot, iv. 140, 166, 172 sqq.
Henry V. of England at Paris, i. 64
— VI. of England, insurrection for, i. 133; restored by Warwick, 135; murdered, 136
— VII. of England, accession, i. 163; invades Brittany, 167; alliance with Maximilian, 171; expedition to France, 172; treatment of Archduke Philip, 250
— VIII. of England, accession, i. 271; courted by Pope Julius II., *ib.*; marries Catherine of Aragon, 284; joins the Holy League, *ib.*; alliance with Ferdinand of Spain, 295; accedes to treaty of Mechlin, 342; invades France, 345; takes Tournay, 346; alliance with Louis XII., 349; camp of cloth of gold, 379; mediates between Charles V. and Francis I., 409, 411; treaty of Bruges with

HENRY

Charles, 413; "Defender of the Faith," *ib.*; declares war against France, 421; remarks on his policy, 451; negociations with Charles V., 454; peace with France, 456; favours Italian League, 466; suit of divorce, 490; evoked to Rome, 491; declares war against Charles V., 492; visits Francis at Boulogne, 552; marries Ann Boleyn, 553; appeals against the Pope to a Council, 555; matrimonial projects, 579; Papist schemes against him, 580; alarm at an invasion, 581; marries Anne of Clèves, 582; treaty with Charles V., 600; invades France, 608; his army, *ib.*; takes Boulogne, 609; dissatisfied with the Emperor, 610; evacuates France, *ib.*; makes peace with France, ii. 53; death, 54
Henry II. of France, accession, ii. 56; his weakness, 60; coronation, *ib.*; visits Italy, 74; sends troops to Scotland, 78; religious persecutions, 79; peace with England, 83; aids the Duke of Parma, 84; opposes the Council of Trent, 85; concludes a treaty with Maurice of Saxony, 87; expedition against Charles V., 91; takes Toul and Metz, 92; retreats, *ib.*; invades Luxembourg and Bouillon, 93; attacks the Netherlands, 106; barbarous mode of warfare, 107; makes peace with the Emperor, 116; treaty with the Pope, 118; persecutions, 136; seizes seven members of the Parliament, 138; death, *ib.*; family, *ib.*
— III. of France, accession, ii. 274; returns from Poland, *ib.*; marries Louisa of Lorraine, 275; deposed by the Poles, 277; joins the League, 281; profligacy, 282; conduct as to Mary, Queen of Scots, 326; as to Elizabeth, *ib.*; flies from Paris, 338; determines to murder Guise, 340; at Tours, 343; alliance with Henry of Navarre, 344; threatens Paris, *ib.*; assassinated by Jacques Clement, 344
— of Navarre, chief of the Hugonots, ii. 183; becomes King of Navarre, 202; marries Margaret of Valois, 206; turns Catholic, 268; arraigned, 273; escapes from court, 278; chief of the Hugonot League, 281; supported by Henry III., 293; offer of duel with Guise, 334; defeats Joyeuse at Coutras, 336; Protector of Evangelical Church, 343; becomes King of France, 345. (*See* Henry IV.)
— IV. of France, offers to be *instructed*, ii. 345 sq.; character, 347; proceeds to Rouen, 348; succoured by Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*; repulsed at Paris, *ib.*; recognised by the Venetians, 349; defeats Mayenne, 350; blockades Paris, 351; withdraws, *ib.*; attempts to surprise that capital, 353; besieges Rouen, 354; converted, 359; abjuration, 360; crowned, 361; enters Paris, *ib.*; takes Laon, 362; attempted assassination, 363; declares war against Philip II., *ib.*; reduces Brittany, 365; signs Edict of Nantes, 366; negociations with Queen Elizabeth, 370; offers her

HOWARD

Calais, 373; peace with Spain, 374; negociations with the Porte, 383; his simple life, 413; desire to colonise, 422; hostility to Austria, 426; alliance, *ib.*; courts the Pope, *ib.*; obtains a divorce, 427; marries Mary de' Medici, 428; invades Savoy, 429; protects Geneva, *ib.*; condemns Biron to death, 430; plan to reconstruct Europe, 431; favours the Jesuits, 440; mediates between the Pope and Venice, 442; plans against Spain and Austria, *ib.*; intrigues with German Princes, 452; passion for Charlotte de Montmorenci, 453; treaty with the German Protestant Union, 454; prepares to invade Germany, 455; discontent in France, 456; assassinated, 457; character, *ib.*
Henry II. of Navarre, i. 407, 471
— IV. of Castile, i. 179; dethroned, 180; death, 185
—, Prince of Portugal, encourages navigation, i. 312
—, Duke of Saxony, i. 589
—, Prince of Brandenburg, iii. 418, 422, 431, 434
—, Cardinal, of Braga, ii. 285; assumes the Portuguese crown, 286; death, 287
Heptameron, the, i. 460
Hérault de Sechelles, iv. 90, 141, 147, 167
Hermandad, insurrectionary association in Valencia, i. 405
—, S., or Holy Brotherhood, established, i. 187
Herring Fishery, ii. 24 and *note*.
Hertzberg, Von, iii. 402, *note*; 403, 497, 502; iv. 74
Hesdin, truce of, i. 119
Hesse-Cassel, elector deposed, iv. 427; disturbances, 602
Hessels, ii. 244
Hexamilion, wall of, i. 94
Hidalgos, their privileges, ii. 404
Hildebrand; i. 325
Hill, Sir R., iv. 540
Hiller, General, iv. 482 sqq.
Hoche, General, iv. 163, 227, 259, 265, 272, 276
Hochstraten, i. 387
Hoeks, party of, i. 157
Hofer, Andrew, iv. 481, 487
Hohenlohe, Count, ii. 318
—, Prince, iv. 96, 193, 422 sqq.
Hohenzollern, House of, i. 21
Holbach, d', Baron, iv. 22
Holland, decline of, iii. 387; occupied by the French, iv. 220; by the Allies, 537
Holmes, Sir R., Admiral, iii. 72, 89
Holstein, a duchy, ii. 507, *note*.
Holy Roman Empire, i. 20
Holzer, Wolfgang, revolt of, i. 90
Hompesch, Baron, iv. 303 sqq.
Hood, Admiral, iv. 156 sqq.
Hôpital, Michel de l', chancellor, ii. 141 sqq., 178 sqq.
Horn, Count, ii. 229, 243; executed, 249
—, Gustavus, ii. 565, 577, 585, 618
—, Arved, iii. 360 sq.
Hortense, mother of Napoleon III., iv. 606 sq.; death, 608
Hosier, Admiral, iii. 312
Hotman, his *Franco-Gallia*, ii. 272
Houchard, General, iv. 146, 153, 160 sq.
Houtman, Cornelius, ii. 420
Howard of Effingham, Lord, ii. 329 371

HOWE

Howe, Admiral, Lord, iii. 527, 537; iv. 224, 417, 527
Howick, Lord, iv. 421
Hoya, Count, ii. 514
Hubertsburg, Peace of, iii. 439
Hugo, Victor, iv. 650
Hugonet and Humbercourt, execution of, i. 153
Hugonots, origin, ii. 140; riots in Paris, ii. 152, 155; proceedings after St. Bartholomew, 268; peace with the Court, ii. 272; scheme of a Confederate Republic, *ib.*; new league, 275; dissatisfied with Henry IV., 366; state after Edict of Nantes, 396; meet at Saumur, 462; insurrection, 530; assisted by Spain, *ib.*; persecuted by Louis XIV., iii. 136, 138 sq.; emigrate, 141
Humann, M., iv. 611
Humières, Baron d', ii. 279
—, d', Marshal, iii. 135, 154 sq.
Hundred Days, the, iv. 553
Hungarians, support Maria Theresa, iii. 354
Hungary, condition of, early in sixteenth century, i. 370; great part of, subjected to the Turks, 596; Turkish campaign in, ii. 97; crown made hereditary, iii. 111
Hunkiar Skelessi, treaty, iv. 609
Hunyad, House of, i. 16
—, John of, i. 16 sq.; imprisoned by Drakul, 18; Regent, *ib.* and 83; defeated at Cossova, 19; defeats the Turks at Semendri, 84; burns Widdin, *ib.*; at Belgrade, 86; death, 87
Huss, John, i. 329; why burnt, 330
Hussars, creation of, i. 91, *note*.
Hutten, Ulrich von, i. 339, 393
Hyde de Neuville, iv. 604
Hyder Ally, iii. 527
Hyndford, Lord, iii. 349, 355, 357

IBRAHIM, Sultan, ii. 620; war with Venice, 621; deposed and strangled, *ib.*
— Pasha, vizier of Solyman I., i. 517, 525; death, 594
—, Pasha of Buda, iii. 108, 111
— Pasha, son of Mehemet Ali, iv. 585, 609
Igelström, iv. 190, 191
Iglau, Peace of, i. 32
Illuminati, in Spain, ii. 398; in Germany, iv. 202
Ilow, Field-marshal, ii. 579, 580, 582
Imaum, what, i. 3
Imbize, ii. 304
Immediate nobility, i. 26
Imperial tribunal (*Kammer-Gericht*), i. 257 sq.
Indulgences, papal, i. 223; origin and progress of, i. 383; traffic in, 384
In cœna Domini, Bull, i. 397
Infantado, Duke de l', iv. 459 sqq.
Infantry, Spanish, i. 289; organisation of, 304
Innocent VIII., Pope, i. 175; war with Ferdinand of Naples, *ib.*; death, 177
— IX., Pope, ii. 356
— X., Pope, ii. 627, 630; repudiates the Peace of Westphalia, 638; condemns the *Augustinus*, iii. 288
— XI., Pope, dispute with Louis XIV. about the *Régale*, iii. 141; opposed to France, 146; supports the election of Joseph Clement

INNOCENT

at Cologne, 147; dispute with the French ambassador, *ib.*; excommunicates Parliament of Paris, 148; death, 154
Innocent XII., Pope, iii. 159; reconciled with France, 160; advises Charles II. to make the House of Bourbon his heirs, 170
— XIII., Pope, iii. 307; death, 312
Inquisition, established in Castile, i. 187 sq.; its political nature, 188; opposed by the Pope, 189; at Rome, ii. 11; in Spain, 144, 399
"Interim," the, ii. 68; resistance against it, 71; Leipsic Interim, 73
Ippolito d'Este, ii. 154
Isabella, of Castile, refuses the crown, i. 180; appointed Henry IV.'s heir, *ib.*; marries Ferdinand, 181; accession, 186; her Moorish wars, 190; death, 246
— II., Queen of Spain, iv. 613; declared of age, 619; suitors, *ib.*; marries Francis de Assis, 620; licentiousness, *ib.*, and 654
—, Queen of Naples, i. 101
— of Hungary, ii. 96; death, 169
— of Poland, i. 594
— Clara Eugenia, Infanta, ii. 375; marries the Archduke Albert, 433; governess of the Spanish Netherlands, *ib.*; at Nieuport, 434; death, 588
Ismailhoff, iii. 445
Isnard, iv. 86 sqq., 139 sqq., 213
Italy, atheism in, i. 335
— decline of, ii. 29
— disturbances in, iv. 606, 635 sqq.
Ivan Alexiowitsch, Czar, iii. 112
— VI., Czar, iii. 363 sq., 446; murdered, 447

JACOBINS, club, iv. 64; petition, 79; propaganda in Belgium, 117; in England, 125; attacked by the *Jeunesse dorée*, 211; closed, *ib.*
Jaffier, ii. 477
Jagellon, House of, i. 34
— Anne, ii. 265
James I. of England, accession, ii. 436; interview with Sully, *ib.*; takes part in the question of Juliers, 454; instigates the Dutch against Vorstius, 478; aids the Elector Palatine, 499; persuades him to withdraw, 501; letter to Bethlem Gabor, 502; mediates the Peace of Stolbova, 521, death, 530
—, Duke of York, professes the Catholic faith, iii. 82; marries the Princess of Modena, 96; advises war, 101. (*See* James II.)
— II. of England, his infatuation, iii. 149; disclaims the aid of Louis XIV., 150; flies to St. Germains, 151; invades Ireland, 152; death, 176
— V. of Scotland, i. 572; marries Mary of Guise, *ib*, 600
— II., Duke of Courland, iii. 280
Janissaries, instituted, i. 4, 6 sq.; revolts of, ii. 504; iii. 113, 330; abolished, iv. 583
Jansenists, account of, iii. 287; persecution of, 406
Jansen, Cornelius, iii. 287
Janson, Nicholas, ii. 4
Jarvis, Admiral, Sir J., iv. 224, 257
Jassy, Peace of, iii. 506
Jeanne d'Albret, ii. 140, 177, 181, 184, 201; death, 202
Jeannin, President, ii. 438 sq., 458

JOHN

Jellachich, iv. 642
"Jenkins' ears," iii. 336
Jenkinson, Anthony, ii. 419
Jerome of Prague, i. 329
Jesuits, instituted, i. 590; ii. 10; in France, 179; in Bavaria, 378; banished from Paris, ii. 363; progress of the, 394 sqq.; abettors of assassination, 396; colleges, 397; state of, early in 17th century, 400; at Constantinople, *ib.*; missionary labours, 401; in Paraguay, *ib.*; expelled from Venice, 442; in Sweden, 518; fall of the, iii. 511 sqq.
Jeunesse dorée, the, iv. 210, 211
Jews in Spain, persecution of, i. 192
Joachim I. of Brandenburg, i. 399, 541
— II. of Brandenburg, i. 589, 591, 595
Joanna, daughter of Henry IV., claims the crown of Castile, i. 186; retires to a convent, 187
—, consort of Archduke Philip, i. 236; "Queen proprietor of Castile," 246; her melancholy, 252; retires to Tordesillas, 255, 405; death, ii. 112
— II. of Naples, i. 53
John Palæologus II., his treaty with the Turks, i. 14
— II. of Aragon, plots against his son Carlos, i. 182; against his daughter Blanche, 183; reduces the Catalans, 184; death, 187
— II. of Portugal, encourages navigation, i. 312
— III. of Portugal, ii. 285; favours the Jesuits, 398, 401
—, Duke of Braganza, ii. 604; ascends the throne of Portugal as John IV., 606; popularity, 629; supported by the Dutch, iii. 66; death, *ib.*
— V. of Portugal, iii. 204; death, 435; bigotry, 512
— VI. of Portugal, and as Regent, bigotry, iv. 209, 283; purchases neutrality, 376; coerced by Napoleon, 452; declares war against England, 454; sails for Brazil, 455; ascends the throne, 572; returns to Portugal and accepts the Constitution, *ib.*; flies on board a British ship, 573; death, 614
— Casimir II. of Poland, protests against the accession of Charles X. in Sweden, iii. 39; weakness, 41; deprecates the wrath of Charles X., 44; defeated, 45; re-enters Poland, 48; besieges Warsaw, 49; defeated, 50; renounces his claim to Sweden, 64
— I. of Sweden, ii. 517; death, 518
—, King of Denmark, ii. 507
—, Prince, the "Navigator," i. 62
— Sigismund of Hungary, ii. 169, 191, 193; death, 265
—, Elector of Saxony, i. 510, 513, 514; at Spires, 515, 533; his bigotry, 535; his steadfastness, 537
— Frederick, Elector of Saxony, i. 547, 582; banned by Charles V., ii. 36; retreats, 43; allies himself with the Bohemians, 44; defeated and captured at Mühlberg, 45; resigns his dominions, 47; rejects the Interim, 70; liberated, 90, 98; death, 102
— George I., Elector of Saxony, ii. 452, 483, 486, 494, 496, 556, 563, 565, 590 sqq.

John George II., Elector of Saxony, iii. 28, 109
— Sigismund, Elector of Brandenburg, ii. 482
— Frederick II., of Saxe Gotha, his conspiracy, ii. 264
— of Wesel, i. 338
— of Austria, Don, son of Charles V., ii. 188, 194; governor of the Netherlands, 298; plots against England, 301; defeated at Rymenants, 302; death, 303; view of his administration, *ib.*
— — —, —, son of Philip IV., ii. 631; captures Barcelona, iii. 16; governor of the Netherlands, 25; defeated at Lestrenoz, 68; drives Niethard from power, 86; minister, 165; death, *ib.*
—, Archduke, iv. 339, 405
—, —, Imperial Vicar, iv. 635, 640; deposed, 647
— Casimir, Count Palatine, ii. 276, 306 sq.
— of Anjou, governor of Genoa, i. 99; attacks Naples, 101; quits Italy, 102; joins the league against Louis XI., 121
—, Prince of Orange, revolts, i. 155
— Ernest of Saxe Weimar, ii. 550
— John Casimir of Kleeburg, ii. 617
— III., of Clèves, i. 582
Joinville, Prince de, iv. 612, 624
Jonas, Justus, i. 397
Jones, Inigo, ii. 482
Jonson, ii. 482
Jordan, Camille, iv. 272 sqq.
Joseph I., King of the Romans, iii. 167; commands the Imperialists, 182; becomes Emperor, 187; death, 199
—, Archduke, birth, iii. 351; King of the Romans, 440 and *note*. (*See* Joseph II.)
— II., Emperor, interviews with Frederick II. at Neisse and Neustadt, iii. 461, 463; extravagant demands, 464 sqq.; character, 471; claims on Bavaria, 472; tries to exchange the Netherlands for it, 474; succeeds to the Austrian dominions, 475: ecclesiastical reforms, *ib.*; treatment of the Pope, 476; oppresses the Hungarians, 477; razes the barrier fortresses, *ib.*; attacks the Dutch, 478; concludes the treaty of Fontainebleau, *ib.*; impolitic treatment of the Netherlanders, 483; alliance with Catherine II., 484; accompanies her to Cherson, 486; declares war against the Porte, 487; death, 498; character, 499
—, Archduke, King of Hungary, iii. 112
—, —, Palatine, iv. 262
— Ferdinand of Bavaria, claims the Spanish succession, iii. 166; death, 169
— I. of Portugal, iii. 435; plot against, 436; declares war against France and Spain, 437
— Clement of Bavaria, iii. 146; chosen elector of Cologne, 147; confirmed, 163; admits French garrisons, 180
—, Father, ii. 476, 558, 562
Josephine Beauharnais, iv. 239
Joubert, Marshal, iv. 263 sqq., 322 sqq.
Jourdan, Marshal, iv. 161, 215 sqq., 234 sqq., 248 sqq., 317 sq., 487, 530
Jourdan *Coupe-tête*, iv. 30
Journalism, French, iv. 65
Journée des dupes, i. 281; *des barricades*, ii. 353
Joyeuse Entrée, what, ii. 221
Jubilee, Papal, i. 327
Juel, Niels, iii. 124, 125
Julia Bella, i. 221.
Juliana of Denmark, iii. 493
Julian Cesarini, Cardinal, i. 16, 17; death, 18
Juliers, Duchy, dispute concerning, ii. 450; consigned to a Brandenburg prince, 461
Julius II., Pope, i. 240; his secular policy, 241; designs on Venice, 244; reduces Perugia and Bologna, 262; excommunicates the Venetians, 266; removes the interdict, 270; invests Ferdinand with Naples, 273; quarrels with Duke of Ferrara, *ib.*; attacks and excommunicates him, 275; in danger at Bologna, 277; besieges Mirandola, 278; flies from Bologna, 280; occupies Parma and Piacenza, 291; claims Ferrara, 291; death, 297; project for liberation of Italy, *ib.*
— III., Pope, elected, ii. 80; reopens the Council of Trent, *ib.*, 85; peace with Henry II., 94; sends Cardinal Pole to England, 103; death, 110
Junis Beg, i. 593 sq.
Junot, General, iv. 265, 303; expedition to Lisbon, 454 sq.
Junta of Seville, iv. 471; of Oporto, 474; Spanish Central, 476, 498; Apostolic, 571
Jurandes, iv. 8
Jus Devolutionis in Netherlands, iii. 71
Justiniani, family of, ii. 190

KABBELJAUWEN, i. 157.
Kamenskoi, Marshal, iv. 429 448, 503
Kantakuzenus, ii. 425
Kara Mustapha, Grand Vizier, iii. 108 sq.; beheaded, 110
Kardis, Peace of, iii. 64
Kaunitz Rittberg, Prince, iii. 390; account of, 395; French policy, 396; plan to divide Prussia, 399; rejects English alliance, 432; policy as to Poland, 463 sqq.; as to the Church, 475; reception of the Pope, 476; obstinacy, 501; urges the suppression of the Jesuits, 518; negociations with France, iv. 88
Kayserlingk, Count, iii. 448, 453
Keats, Admiral, iv. 439, 474
Keene, Sir Benjamin, iii. 423 sq.
Keith, Admiral, Lord, iv. 337, 347, 353
—, Marshal, iii. 403, 418
Kellermann, Marshal, iv. 112, 156
Kemeni, Peter, iii. 104 sq.
Kepler, ii. 445, *note*.
Keppel, Commodore, iii. 428, 527
Kersaint, iv. 115, 153
Kettler, House of, iii. 374
Khevenhiller, General, iii. 356 sq., 368
Kiaja Bey, what, i. 12
Kiel, Peace of, iv. 538
Kinis, Paul, Count of Temesvar, i. 98
Kinsky, Count, ii. 581
Kléber, General, iv. 156, 215, 219, 248, 303, 329, 330, 353
Klein, Schnellendorf, Convention of, iii. 355
Klesel, Cardinal, ii. 446, 480 sqq.
Klingspor, Marshal, iv. 448, 449
Klopstock, iv. 201
Kloster Seven, Convention, iii. 410
— Seyvern, alliance, i. 545
Knights, German, i. 24, 301; disorders of, 501; controlled, 503
— of St. John, ii. 189
Knipperdolling, Bernhard, i. 567
Kollontay, iv. 180, 190
Kolokotroni, iv. 584
Kolowrat, Count, iv. 480, 637
Konge-Lov, Danish, iii. 120
Koprili, Mahomet, iii. 104
—, Achmet, 105 sq.
—, Mustapha, 114 sq.
Korneuburg, treaty of, i. 196
Korsakoff, General, iv. 323
Kosciuszko, iv. 180; victory at Dubienka, 186; retires into Saxony, 190; commander-in-chief, 191; at Warsaw, 192; defeated at Maciewice, 194; liberated by Paul I., 198; declines Napoleon's offers, 428
Kossuth, Louis, iv. 602, 629, 631 sq., 637, 641 sq.; flight, 644
Kotzebue, murdered, iv. 577
Kray, Marshal, iv. 320, 338
Kunz von Kauffungen, i. 22
Kurakin, Prince, iii. 249; iv. 511
Kutschuk Kainardji, Peace of, iii. 469, 484
Kutusoff, General, iii. 505; iv. 395, 400 sqq., 504, 516, 526, 529

LABIAU, treaty of, iii. 52
Labourdonnaye, iii. 282
La Chaise, Père, iii. 138, 289.
La Châtardie, iii. 364
Lacoste, iv. 87, 90
Lacy, Marshal, iii. 332
Ladislaus Posthumus of Hungary, birth, i. 35; elected King of Bohemia, 36; of Hungary, 37; crowned at Prague, 83; flies to Vienna, 86; his hypocrisy, 88; death, *ib.*
— of Poland, plots with the Cossacks, iii. 42
Lafayette, iii. 525, 536; commander of the National Guard, iv. 50; offers to resign, 53; at Versailles, 61; a *Feuillant*, 78; candidate for the mayoralty, 84; commands the Republican army, 89; letter to the Legislative Assembly, 90; attempts to save the King, 92; flight, 106; imprisonment, 107, *note*; insists, as a deputy, on Napoleon's abdication, 557; agitates against Charles X., 586; takes command of National Guard, 589; helps Louis Philippe, 591; dismissed by that monarch, 603
Lafitte, iv. 590 sq., 603
La Flèche, college of, ii. 396
La Galigai, ii. 431, 466, 470, 472; executed, 474
Lagrange, iv. 621 sqq.
Laharpe, Colonel, iv. 293, 295
Laibach, Congress at, iv. 575
Lainez, ii. 154
l'ala Mohammed, ii. 388
Lalaing, Geo. de, ii. 307
Lally Tollendal, iv. 17, 63, 120
La Marck, Count de, iv. 72
Lamartine, iv. 621; member of Provisional Government, 623; firmness, *ib.* sq., 625, 627
Lamballe, Princess de, iv. 109
Lambesc, Prince de, iv. 49
Lameth, Alexander de, iv. 68, 73, 106

LAMOIGNON

Lamoignon de Malesherbes, iv. 119, 168
Lamoricière, General, iv. 623, 650
La Motte, Madame de, iii. 541
Landfriede, made perpetual, i. 257
Landois, i. 161; executed, 162
Lang, Bishop of Gurk, i. 280, 292; made cardinal, 294
Languedoc canal, iii. 261
Lanjuinais, iv. 142
Lannes, Marshal, iv. 203, 330, 337, 393, 401, 423, 482, 484
Lannoy, i. 426, 443, 445, 458, 465, 477
La Noue, ii. 269, 305, 350
Lansquenets, i. 289, 305
Lanterne, the, iv. 53
La Réveillère Lépaux, iv. 231 sq., 271, sqq., 283, 296, 315, 322
La Rochefoucauld, Duke de, iii. 9
La Rochejaquelein, iv. 133, 156
La Rosa, Martinez de, iv. 563, 613
Las Casas, introduces the slave trade, ii. 15; iii. 270
Lasczy, or A'Lasco, i. 523
Las Minas, iii. 385, 388
Lateran, Council of, i. 282, 290
Latour, murdered, iv. 641
—, General, iv. 251, 252
La Tremouille, treaty with the Swiss, i. 346
La Valette, Grand Master of the Order of St. John, ii. 189
Lavalette, iv. 270, 273, 310
Lavardin, Marquis de, iii. 147
Lavater, iv. 324
La Vendée, insurrection in, iv. 132, 156, 227
La Vieuville, ii. 254 sq.; iii. 12
Lavoisier, iv. 168
Lauenburg, Duke of, ii. 574
Launay, De, iv. 49, 50
Lautree, i. 290; governor of the Milanese, 410, 414 sqq., 420, 450, 488
Law, John, iii. 296
Law, international, progress of, iii. 269 sq.
Lawes, ii. 482
League, *French*, origin, ii. 279; supported by Philip II., 294; manifesto, 296; end of, 365; *German*, of Nuremberg, i. 588; Rhenish, iii. 27; dissolved, 86; of Augsburg, 144; founded the European system, 269; *Holy* (1511), i. 284; (1571), ii. 194; (1609), 450; (1684), iii. 110
Leake, Admiral, iii. 189
Learning, revival of, i. 339
Lebas, iv. 163
Le Brun, iv. 104, 124, 142, 150, 335, 380
Lee, Dr., i. 472
Leeds, Duke of, iii. 506
Lefèbvre, Marshal, iv. 423; Duke of Dantzic, 430, 477, 482
—, historian, iv. 435
Legates, what, i. 309
Legendre, iv. 92, 167
Legion of Honour, iv. 359
Lehrbach, Count, iv. 263, 320
Leibnitz, scheme for the conquest of Egypt, iii. 86 *note*, 272; iv. 300
Leicester, Earl of, ii. 312; in the Netherlands, 321 sq.
Leipsic Disputation, i. 392
— Convention of, ii. 563
Le Jay, the Jesuit, ii. 394
Lemaistre, Antony, iii. 288
Lemanic Republic, iv. 294
Lentant, iii. 141
Leo X., Pope, accession, i. 341; hires the Swiss against Louis XII., 343; duplicity of his character, 348; alliance with Francis I., 357; conspiracy of cardinals against him, 358; projects a crusade, 371; his extravagance, 384; sale of indulgences, 385; praises Luther, 388; Bull respecting indulgences, 390; Bull against Luther, 394; excommunicates him, 396; Leo's rapacity and treachery, 409; treaty with Francis I., 410; with Charles V., *ib.*; excommunicates Francis I., 413; death, 417; prosperity of Rome under, 418
Leo XI., Pope, ii. 441
— XII., Pope, iv. 578, 603
Léoben, armistice of, iv. 264
Leonardo da Vinci, i. 230
Leopold I., Emperor, iii. 29; character, 30; a rival of Louis XIV., 33; alliance with the Poles, 53; marries the Infanta Margaret Theresa, 83; secret treaty with Louis XIV., *ib.*; treaty with Elector of Brandenburg, 93; with the Dutch, 94; double policy, *ib.*; declares war against France, 97; peace, 103; concludes the Peace of Vasvar, 105; attacked by the Turks, 108; flies from Vienna, *ib.*; treaty with the Hungarians, 111; makes the Hungarian crown hereditary, *ib.*; treaty with the Dutch, 153; peace with France, iii. 163; claims the Spanish succession, 166; transfers his claim to his son Charles, 167; negociations with William III., 176; declares war against Louis, 181; death, 187; character of his reign, 263
— II., Emperor, crowned at Presburg, iii. 504 sq.; favours French emigrants, iv. 74; circular from Padua, 80; at Pilnitz, 81; supports the claims of German princes, 85; treaty with Prussia, 86; death, *ib.*
—, Grandduke of Tuscany; marriage, iii. 471; succeeds to the Austrian dominions, 500; view of his reign in Tuscany, *ib.*; his code, 501; negociations with Prussia, *ib.*; Convention of Reichenbach, 503; peace with the Porte, *ib.*; reduces Belgium, 504; becomes emperor. (*See* Leopold II.)
— II. of Tuscany, iv. 636
—, Archduke, plots against Rodolph and Matthias, ii. 480
— William, Archduke, ii. 608 sqq.; iii. 8 sqq.
— of Lorraine, iii. 163
— of Anhalt-Dessau, Prince, iii. 342, 377, 381
— William of Baden, iii. 106
— of Saxe-Coburg, King of the Belgians, iv. 598; defeated at Tirlemont *ib.*; marries Louisa, daughter of Louis Philippe, 599
Lerma, Duke of, ii. 430, 433, 476
Lescinska, Mary, marries Louis X.V. iii. 309
Lescun, i. 410, 420 sq.
Lesdiguières, Constable, ii. 524, 530
Lesley, Earl of Leven, ii. 554
Leslie, Lieutenant, ii. 581, 582, 584
Lessart, De, iv. 85, 87, 109
Lestock, Admiral, iii. 372
Lestocq, iii. 364, 443
Le Tellier, chancellor, iii. 140, 261
—, Père, iii. 209, 289
Letourneur, iv. 231 sq., 282

LEO

LOUIS

Levant Company, ii. 419
Leyva, Antonio de, i. 289, 443, 468, 473, 494, 530, 564
L'Huillier, iv. 141
Liancourt, Duke de, iv. 51, 93
Lichtenstein, Prince, iii. 384 sq.
Ligue du Bien Public, i. 121; its political effects, 124
Ligues de la Haute Allemagne, i. 31
Ligurian Republic, iv. 270; incorporated with France, 391
L'Ile, Adam, grandmaster of St. John, i. 428
Limerick, Pacification of, iii. 152
Limon, Marquis de, iv. 99
Lindet, Robert, iv. 322
Lionne, Marquis de, iii. 28, 81
Lippe Schaumburg, Count, iii. 437
Literature, German, origin, iv. 201
Lobkowitz, Diepold von, ii. 481 sq.
Locke, iv. 26
Lockhart, General, iii. 26.
Lodi, treaty of, i. 52
Lofoe, Congress at, iii. 251
Loignac, ii. 340
Lola Montez, iv. 633
Lombard, Peter, i. 337
London, in 16th century, ii. 415
—, treaty of, respecting Greece, iv. 584; Syria, 610
Longueville, Duke of, ii. 348, 608; iii. 7 sq.
—, Duchess, iii. 9
Lorges, de, Marshal, iii. 158
L'Orient, expedition to, iii. 386
L'Ormée, iii. 15
Loredano, Luigi, i. 93, 94
Lorraine, Cardinal of, ii. 124, 128, 136, 139, 152, 172, 179, 184, 206; death, 272
—, Duke of, joins the League, ii. 296
—, United to France, iii. 325
Los Arcos, Duke de, ii. 629 sq.
Loudon, General, iii. 421 sqq., 488 sqq.; iv. 319
Loudun, treaty of, ii. 466
Louis XI., writes to Lorenzo de' Medici, i. 109; quarrel, when Dauphin, with his father, 113; flight to Burgundy, *ib.*; character, 114; coronation, 116; proceedings against the Pope and clergy, 117; recovers Rousillon, 119; and the towns on the Somme, *ib.*; attacks Brittany, 120; breach with Duke of Burgundy, 120; contest with the *Ligue du Bien Public*, 122; enters Paris, 123; annexes Normandy, 125; popular arts, 126; seized at Peronne, 129; conduct at Liége, 130; annuls the treaty of Peronne, 136; league against renewed, 138; annexes Guienne, *ib.*; war with Burgundy, 139; truce with Charles the Bold, 139; treaties with the Hanse Towns, 140; with Edward IV., 145; allies himself with Frederick III. and Swiss Cantons, 147; extorts Provence from René d'Anjou, 150; takes possession of Burgundy, 151; negociations with Henry of Burgundy, 152; hostilities with, 155; overruns Franche Comté, 156; tyranny of his declining days, 157; death, 159
— XII., accession, i. 223; marries Charles VIII.'s widow, 223, 226; invades Italy, 227; enters Milan, 228; aids the Florentines, 230; assists the Borgias, 231; designs on Naples, 232; obtains

LOUIS
investiture of Milan, 235; his troops expelled from Naples, 237; attacks Spain, *ib.*; treaty with Ferdinand, 249; meets that monarch at Savona, 254; attacks the Venetians, 266; quarrels with the Swiss, 272; assembles an Ecclesiastical Council, 276; league with Maximilian, 285; reverses in Italy, 291; betrays the King of Navarre, 297; reduces Lombardy, 343; driven out, 344; submits to the Pope, 347; marries Mary, sister of Henry VIII., 349; death, *ib.*
Louis XIII., ii. 458; declared of age, 465; married the Infanta Anna, 466; character, 469; called the "Just," 473; assists the German Catholic League, 493; annexes Bearn, *ib.*; slyness, 538; invades Italy, 560; receives the submission of Duke of Lorraine, 568; promises to assist Wallenstein, 578; enters Nanci, 586; declares war against Spain, 590; Italian League, 592; puts France under the protection of the Virgin, 598; treaty with the Weimarian generals, 599; conduct to his mother, 601; aids the revolted Catalans, 604; at Perpignan, 611; death, 614
— XIV., birth, ii. 598; proclaimed of age, iii. 11; first arms, 17; as member of the Rhenish League, 31; his passion for Mazarine's niece, 32; marries the Infanta Maria Theresa, 34; assumes the government, 35; assists the Portuguese Regent, 67 sq.; his absolutism, 69; character, *ib.*; compels the Pope to dismiss his Corsican Guard, 70; claims Brabant, &c., 71; treaty with the Dutch, *ib.*; declares war against England, 73; perfidy, 74; alliance with Portugal, 75; invades the Netherlands, *ib.* sq.; seizes Franche Comté, 76; anger against the Dutch, 80; seizes Lorraine, 83; treaty with the Emperor respecting the Spanish Succession, *ib.*; influence in Germany, 84; offers to the Elector of Brandenburg for the partition of Holland, 85; declares war against the Dutch, 88; invades the Netherlands, 89; passage of the Rhine, *ib.*; in Alsace, 95; coalition against, *ib.*; annexes Franche Comté, 97; pensions Charles II., 99, 101; Flemish campaign (1678), *ib.*; Peace of Nimeguen, 102; peace with the Emperor, 103; assists him against the Turks, 106; seeks Polish crown for Prince of Conti, 114; dictates a peace to the Northern States, 126; encroachments in Germany, 130; seizes Deux-Ponts, 131, takes possession of Strasburg, *ib.*; encroachments in the Netherlands, 132; occupies Casale, *ib.*; alliances against him, 133; treaty with Elector of Brandenburg, *ib*; reduces Algiers, *ib.*; invades the Netherlands, 134; truce with the Dutch, 135; humbles the Genoese, *ib.*; persecutes the Protestants, 136; his mistresses, 137; marries Madame de Maintenon, *ib.*; further persecutions, 138; revokes the Edict of Nantes, 140; dispute with Innocent XI., 141; seizes Orange, 143; demands on the Palatinate, 144; declares war against the Emperor, 145; interferes in the Electorate of Cologne, 146; violent letter to the Pope, 148; seizes Avignon, *ib.*; declares war against the Dutch, 152; devastates the Palatinate, 153; attempts a descent on England, 156; deserts his army, 157; proposals to the Emperor, 159; conciliates Innocent XII., 160; proposes peace, 162; treaty for partition of Spain, 168; accepts the Spanish Succession, 172 sq.; reserves Philip V.'s rights to French crown, 176; recognises the Pretender, *ib.*; proposes a peace, 192, 195; family losses, 202; concludes the Peace of Utrecht, 204 sq.; bigotry, 209; perfidy, 210; death, *ib.*; repentance, 211; age of, 257; manners and literature, 258, 260
Louis XV., affianced to the Infanta, iii. 307; marries the daughter of Stanislaus, 309; declares war against the Emperor, 321; peace, 324; guarantees the Pragmatic Sanction, *ib.*; supports the claims of Charles Albert, 348; treaty with Spain, 371; designs against England, 372; takes the command of his army, 373; *le bien aimé*, 374, *note*; at Fontenoy, 382; threatens Holland, 386; hatred of Frederick II., 396; treaty with Austria, 400, 406; dispute with the Parliament, *ib.*; wounded by Damiens, 407; fresh treaty with Austria, 419; Family Compact, 429; Peace of Paris, 438; profligacy, 507; suppresses the Parliament, 510; attempts a compromise with the Jesuits, 515; seizes Avignon, 517; peculation, 520; death, 521; mischief of his reign, iv. 32
— XVI., iii. 473; supplies Joseph II. with money, *ib.*; accession, 521; alliance with America, 525; war with England, 526; banishes the Parliament, 544; Royal Session, iv. 45 sq.; visits Paris, 51; conducted to the Tuileries, 63; letter to King of Spain, 74; attempted flight, 75; notifies his acceptance of the Constitution, 83; recalls his brothers, 85; discountenances the emigrants, 86; declares war against the Emperor, 89; dismisses the Girondists, 90; on 20th June, 92; negociates with the Coalition, 93; disclaims doing so, 99; on 10th August, 101; takes refuge in the Assembly, 102; imprisoned in the Temple, 105; life there, 118; arraigned, 119; condemned, 121; execution, 122
— XVII., death, iv. 226
— XVIII., dismissed by the Venetians, iv. 238; writes to Bonaparte, 325; banished by Paul I., 344; restoration proclaimed by the Department of the Seine, 544; and at Bordeaux, 546; enters Paris, 547; declaration of St. Omer, *ib.*; grants a Charter, 550; flies from Paris, 553; returns, 557; appoints Talleyrand minister, 562; character, 564; death, 578
— Philippe of Orleans (*see* Chartres), character, iv. 578; designs,
LOUIS
590; Lieutenant-general, 591; machinations against Charles X., 592; King of the French, 593; betrays the Spanish Liberals, 602; attacks Don Miguel, 604; life attempted by Fieschi and Alibaud, 605; dismisses Louis Napoleon, 607; avarice, 608; Eastern policy, 610; fortifies Paris, *ib.*; *entente cordiale*, 611; visits England, 612; Quadruple Alliance, 616; Spanish marriages, 619 sq.; Reform banquets, 620; abdicates, 622; flies to England, 624; death, 649
Louis, Duke of Orleans, rebels, i. 160; defeated and confined, 166
— III. of Anjou, i. 53, 54
— de Bourbon, Duke of Parma, becomes King of Etruria, iv. 341
— II. of Hungary, i. 370, 519 sq.
—, King of Bavaria, iv. 506; abdicates, 633
— of Nassau, ii. 234 sqq., 247 sqq.; death, 259
— Ernest of Brunswick, iii. 479
— of Baden, iii. 113 sq., 182
—, Count of Vaudemont, i 474
Louisa of Savoy, i. 351, 415, 433, 494; death, 496
— Juliana, Electress Palatine, ii. 461. *note.*
Loulé, Marquis, iv. 573
Loustalot, iv. 48
Louvain, Articles of, i. 611
Louvet, iv. 116, 142, 153, 174, 175
Louvois, iii. 89 sq., 138 sqq.; death, 156
Lowe, Sir Hudson, iv. 491
Löwendahl, Count, iii, 384, 387
Löwenhaupt, General, iii. 236, 238, 241
Lowositz, battle, iii. 404
Loyola, Ignatius, i. 407, 590; ii. 10
Lübeck, Peace of, ii. 554
Lublin, Diet of, iii. 229
Lubomirski, iii. 48, 230, 241
Lucchesini, Marquis, iii. 502; iv. 181 sqq., 282, 420
Luckner, General, iv. 86, 89
Ludovisio, Ludovico, ii. 523
Luines, Charles d'Albert, Duke of, ii. 469; plots against Marshal D'Ancre, 470 sq.; conduct towards the Queen-mother, 475; administration, 476, 493; made Constable, 523; death, 524
Luna, Don Alvaro de, i. 56 sq.
Lunden, treaty of, iii. 127
Lunéville, Peace of, iv. 340
Luther, Martin, i. 382; visits Rome, *ib.*; his Theses, 386; summoned to Rome, 389; before Cajetanus, *ib.*; flies from Augsburg, 390; Papal Bull against, 394; progress of his opinions, 395; writes to the Pope, *ib.*; burns the Pope's Bull, 396; excommunicated, *ib.*; at Worms, 398; outlawed, 400; at the Wartburg, *ib.*; doctrine of Consubstantiation, 402; favoured by Imperial Government, 497; as "Junker George," *ib.*; returns to Wittemberg, 499; publishes his German Testament, *ib.*; his moderation, 500; increasing boldness, 505; lays aside his monk's dress, 506; marries Catherine von Bora, 510; meets Zwingli at Marburg, 535; proceeds to Coburg, 536; political views, 542; at Leipsic, 589; at Diet of Ratisbon, 590; sanctions the bigamy of Landgrave of Hesse, 592; death, 619
Lutheran union at Oxford, ii. 9

LUXEMBOURG
Luxembourg, Duke of, iii. 102, 155 sqq.; death, 160
Lynar, Count, iii. 352, 409
Lyon, trade of, ii. 24; destruction ordered, iv. 157
Lyons, Admiral, iv. 661

MAANEN, Van. iv. 596
Macdonald, Marshal, iv. 314, 321, 332, 484, 562
Machiavelli. i. 309; ii. 30; Borgia his hero, *ib.*
Mack, General, in Netherlands, iv. 134, 135, 214 sq.; in Italy, 313 sq.; German campaign, 395 sqq.
Madalinski, iv. 190
Madeleine, daughter of Francis I., marries James V. of Scotland, i. 572
Madrid, treaty of, 1526, i. 462; becomes the capital of Spain, ii.145; treaty of, 1750, iii. 391; insurrection at, iv. 468
Magellan, voyage of, ii. 13
Mahmoud I., Sultan, iii. 331; offers his mediation to the Christian Powers, 379; character of his reign, 457; death, 458
— II., Sultan, iv. 580; suppresses the Janissaries, 583; offends the European Powers, 585; implores their aid, 609; treaty with Russia, *ib.*; death, 610
Mahomet I., i. 13
— II., takes Constantinople, i. 1; his legislation, 8; sultan, 20; at Constantinople, 75 sq.; reduces the Morea, 77; seizes Athens and Thebes, 78; conquers some Greek islands, 79; government, *ib.*; destroys Pera, 82; overruns Servia, 84, 91; marches against Belgrade, 85; defeated and wounded, 86; reduces Bosnia, 92; drives the Venetians from the Morea, 95; enterprise against Italy, 111; death, 112
— III., Sultan, ii. 385; war in Hungary, *ib.*, 386; death, 387
— IV., Sultan, ii. 621, iii. 104; marches against Austria, 108; deposed, 113
— Sokolli, Grand Vizier, ii. 381, 382
Maillard, iv. 50, 61, 109
Maillebois, Marshal, iii. 353 sqq., 383 sqq.
Maine, Du, Duke, iii. 295 sq., 305
Maintenon, Madame de, iii. 137 sq., 158, 211
Maison, Marshal, iv. 592 sq.
Maîtrises, iv. 8
Majestäts Brief, Rodolph II.'s, ii. 447, 480; cancelled, 499
"Majesty," title of, i. 159
Malagrida, iii. 437, 513 sq.
Malachowski, iv. 180, 183
Malcolm, Admiral, iv. 599
Malet, General, conspiracy, iv. 521
Malisset, Société, iii. 520
Mallet du Pan, iv. 93, 94, 99
Malmesbury, Lord, iv. 257 sqq. 282
Malmö, armistice, iv. 635
Malta, seized by Bonaparte, iv. 303
Malvenda, ii. 32
Mamalukes, meaning of, i. 369, *note*; oppose Bonaparte, iv. 303 sq.
Mancin, iv. 637
Mancini, Mary, *ib.* 32
—, Olimpia, iii. 115
Mandat, General, iv, 100 sq.
Manège Club, iv. 331
Manini, Louis, Doge, iv. 265 sqq.
Mansfeld, Count, ii. 262, 330 sq., 385, 500 sq., 545 sqq.

MANTUA
Mantua, Convention of, iv. 550; succession of, ii. 559 sqq.
Manuel IV., iii. 119
Marat, account of, iv. 66; horrible denunciations, 79; cowardice, 98; in the *Commune*, 105; share in the massacres, 111; in the Convention, 115; trial, 138; assassination, 143; divine honours to, 144
Maraviglia, i. 561
Marburg, conference at, i. 535
Marcellus II., Pope, ii. 110
Marck, Robert de la, Duke of Bouillon, i. 344; defies Charles V. 408
—, De la, ii. 252
Marcoussis, Treaty, i. 227
Margaret, Queen of Denmark, ii. 506
— of Savoy, vice-Queen of Portugal, ii. 605
— of Anjou, reconciled with Warwick, i. 135; captured and imprisoned, 136; liberated, 145
— of Navarre, death, ii. 79
— of Valois, ii. 200, 202, 206, 292, 427
—, daughter of Emperor Maximilian, governess of the Netherlands, i. 256
— of Parma, governess of the Netherlands, ii. 225, 230 sqq., 240 sqq., 311
Maria Theresa of Austria, iii. 338; marries Francis of Lorraine, 339; accession to the Austrian dominions, *ib.*; rejects Frederick II.'s offers, 344, 346; league against her, 351; vain appeal to Louis XV., 353; proclaimed *King* in Hungary, 354; at Pressburg, *ib.*; joined by King of Sardinia, 359; English enthusiasm for, 367; high demands of, 369 sq.; treaty with Sardinia, 371; with Maximilian Joseph, 378; with Frederick II. at Dresden, 382; change of policy, 395; courts Madame de Pompadour, 396, quarrels with England, 397; prepares to attack Frederick II., 404; treaty with Russia, 406; averse to peace, 419; concludes the Peace of Hubertsburg, 439; opposes the partition of Poland, 461, 465, and *note*; claims parts of Bavaria, 472; endeavours to preserve the peace, 473; treaty of Teschen, 474; death, *ib.*; title of "Apostolical," 475
— — of Spain, contracted to Louis XIV., iii. 33; renounces the Spanish inheritance, *ib.*; death, 137
— Louisa, Queen of Spain, iv. 130; plots against her own son, 460
— Anna, Regent of Spain, iii. 71, 165
— I., of Portugal, iv. 209, 283, 455; death, 572
— da Gloria, Queen of Portugal, iv. 614 sq.; flies to Brazil, 615; returns to Lisbon, 616; marriages, *ib.*; death, 655
— Louisa, Queen of Etruria, iv. 455; obtains Lucca, 561
— —, Archduchess, marries Napoleon, iv. 593; returns to Austria, 546; obtains Parma, &c., 551
Marie Antoinette; marries the Dauphin, iii. 471, 521; favours the Americans, 524; character, 540; unpopularity, 544; counsels flight, iv. 51; opposes the journey to Varennes, 76; rejects the aid

MATTHIAS
of Lafayette, 93; in the Temple, 118; condemned, 151; executed, 152
Marie, iv. 623
Marienburg, treaty of, iii. 49
Marillac, Archbishop of Vienne, ii. 118
Maritime Law, iii. 520
Marlborough, Duke of, iii. 97; his treachery, 160; commander-in-chief, 179; campaign of 1702, 181; campaign of 1704, 185; defeats Tallard at Blenheim, *ib.*; occupies Trèves, &c., 186; campaign of 1705, 188; Prince of the empire, *ib. note*; defeats Villeroi at Ramilies, 192; campaigns of, 1707, 1708, 194 sq.; supplanted, 199; campaign of 1711, 200; accused of peculation, 201; restored, 209
Marmont, Marshal, iv. 330, 393, 483, 499 sq., 543, 589
Marmontel, iv. 31, 38
Marot, psalms of, ii. 136
Marranos, what, ii. 187
Marseillaise, la (hymn), iv. 94
Marseillese, iv. 94, 112, 116
Marsillac. (*See* La Rochefoucauld, Duke of.)
Marsin, Marshal, iii. 183, 185, 191, 192
Martignac, M. de, iv. 579
Martinitz, Von, ii. 484 sq.
Martinuzzi, or Brother George, i. 594; ii. 96; assassinated, 97
Mary, Queen of England; accession, ii. 103; marries Philip, 104; declares war against France, 122; grief at losing Calais, 125; death, 128
—, Consort of William III., Queen, iii. 151
—, Queen of Scots, betrothed to the Dauphin Francis, ii. 78; marriage, 126; compelled to leave France, 150; executed, 325
— of Burgundy, daughter of Charles the Bold; grants the "Grand Privilege," i. 152; her suitors, 154; marries Maximilian, *ib.*; death, 157
—, Queen of Hungary, governess of the Netherlands, i. 545, 584; inclines to the Protestants, 591
Masaccio, i. 103
Masaniello, ii. 629 sq.
Maso de' Albizzi, i. 46
Massa, Prince of, ii. 630 sq.
Masséna, Marshal, in Piedmont, 1793, iv. 164; in 1795 and 1796, 235, 240, 262; character, 291; in Switzerland, 1799, 317 sqq.; in Italy, 1800, 336; 1805, 400 sq.; invades Naples, 411; in Germany, 1809, 481; in Spain, 1810, 499
Massillon, iii. 307
Mata Florida, Marquis, iv. 568
Matthews, Admiral, iii. 372, 373
Matthias Corvinus, invades Bohemia, i. 193; crowned by Papal Legate, 194; visits Frederick III., 195; reduces Poland, 196; besieges Vienna, *ib.*; concludes a peace with Wladislaus, 197; drives Frederick III. from his capital and reduces Austria, 197; death, 198
Matthias, Archduke and Emperor, in the Netherlands, ii. 301; retires on a pension, 309; viceroy of Hungary, 380, 384, 388; family compact against his brother, Rodolph II., 416; extorts from him Hungary and Austria, *ib.*; at Prague, 480; King of Bohemia,

481; elected Emperor, *ib.*; mental and bodily decay, 483; death, 486
Matthys, Jan, i. 567
Mavrocordato, iv. 581
Maupeou, Chancellor, iii. 508; *Parlement*, 510, 519, 521
Maurepas, Count, iii. 337, 521 sqq.
Maurevert, ii. 207
Maurice, Duke of Saxony, i. 607; his crafty policy, 612; forms a treaty with Charles V., ii. 36; and with Ferdinand, King of Bohemia, 41; attacks his cousin's electorate, 42; shut up in Königsberg, 44; invested with the Saxon electorate, 69; protests against the Interim *ib.*; opposes the Emperor, 81; besieges Magdeburg, 82, 86; secret treaty with France, *ib.*; demands the liberation of the Landgrave of Hesse, 87; his dissimulation, 88; declares against Charles, *ib*; enters Augsburg, 89; Innsbruck, 91; campaign against the Turks, 97; death, 101
—, Landgrave of Hesse, ii. 452
—, son of William the Silent, ii. 313; Stadtholder of Holland, Zealand, and Utrecht, 318; commander-in-chief, 324; conquests, 331; governor of Gelderland and Overyssel, *ib.*; takes Gertruydenberg and Groningen, 368; Stadtholder of the Seven United Provinces, *ib.*; suspected by the Dutch, 434; defeats the Spaniards at Nieuport, 434; takes Sluys, 436; procures the death of Barneveldt, 479; occupies Rees, &c., 482; supports the Elector Palatine, 490; death, 545
Maximilian I. of Bavaria, ii. 448; organises the Holy League, 450; scheme to make him Emperor, 455; revives the League, 482; advice to Elector Palatine, 489; aids the Emperor, 494; made an elector, 501; jealousy of Wallenstein, 552; assumes the command, 569; solicits the aid of Wallenstein, 571; counsels his assassination, 579; declares his neutrality, 628; again arms, 634
— II. of Bavaria, iv. 633
— Emanuel of Bavaria, iii. 109, 156; seizes Ulm, &c., 180; campaign of 1703, 183; deprived of Bavaria, 186; banished, 188
— Joseph, last elector of Bavaria, iii. 378; death, 472
— Joseph, first King of Bavaria, alliance with Napoleon, iv. 396; joins the French, 397; joins the Coalition, 535
Maximilian I., Emperor, marries Mary of Burgundy, i. 154; defeats the French at Guinegate, 156; proceedings in Flanders, 164; elected King of Romans, *ib.*; arrested at Bruges, 165; marries Anne of Brittany, 167; makes peace with Charles VIII., 168; reduces the Netherlands, *ib.*; marriage with Anne annulled, 169; deceived by Charles VIII., 171; treaty with Wladislaus of Hungary, 200; becomes Emperor, 202; expedition to Burgundy, 227; claims regency of Castile, 256; his disputes with the electors, 258; contemplates an expedition to Italy, 260; assumes the title of "Emperor Elect," *ib.*; unsuccessful expedition against the Venetians, 261; foments the League of Cambray, *ib.*; reconciles himself with Louis XII., 262; besieges Padua, 269; dismisses his army, 270; again attacks the Venetians, 274; league with Louis XII. to divide Italy, 285; takes the title of *Pontifex Maximus*, *ib.*; joins Henry VIII. at Terouenne, 315; invades Italy, 362; ignominious flight, *ib.*; appointed generalissimo of a crusade, 372; death, 374
Maximilian II., Emperor, accession, ii. 174; Hungarian war, 191; truce with Sultan Selim, 193; grief at the St. Bartholomew, 219; intercedes for the Netherlanders, 246; toleration, 264; obtains Hungary, 265; contests with the Pope about Tuscany, *ib.*; seeks the crown of Poland, *ib.*; death, 266
—, Archibald, seeks the Polish crown, ii. 380; captured, *ib.*; defeated by the Turks, 386
Maximum in France, its effects, iv. 211
Mayenne, Duke of, ii. 335; heads the League, 342 sq.; attacks Henry IV. at Arques, 348; opposes the designs of Philip II., 349; defeated at Ivry, 350; suppresses the "Sixteen," 354; engages to support the Infanta's pretensions to the crown, 357; his selfish policy, 358; treaty with Henry IV., 364
Mazarini, Giulio, Cardinal, ii. 561, 562; succeeds Richelieu as minister, 614; his origin, 615; attacks Tuscany, 627; policy in the Neapolitan revolt, 631; promotes the continuance of the war, iii. 3; harsh government, 4; insensibility to insult, 8; as general, 10; exiled, *ib.*; invades France, 12; resumes the ministry, *ib.*; again retires, 14; returns, 15; avarice, 16; alliance with Cromwell, 17; treaties with England, 24; aims at the Imperial Crown for Louis, 28; Spanish negociations, 32; completes the Peace of the Pyrenees, 34; death and character, 35
—, Michael, Cardinal, ii. 634
Mazeppa, Ivan, iii. 238, 239
Mazzini, iv. 635, 645 sq.
Mechlin, treaty of, i. 342
Mediatised Princes, iv. 416
Medici, House of, i. 47; expelled from Florence, 205; restored, 293; expelled, 482. Giovanni de', i. 47. Cosmo de', i. 47, 102. Pietro de', i. 103, 122 sq. Lorenzo the Magnificent, i. 104; league with Venice and Milan, 107; attempt on his life, 108; proceeds to Naples, 110; tyranny, 176; death, 177. Julian, brother of Lorenzo, i. 104; assassinated, 108. Pietro, son of Lorenzo, i. 177; interview with Charles VII., 205; expelled, 206; death, 243. Giovanni, son of Lorenzo, Cardinal, i. 176, 178; captured at Ravenna, 289; enters Florence, 293; his Pagan tastes, 335; elected Pope, 341. (*See* Leo X.) Julian, son of Lorenzo, i. 292 sq.; retires to Rome, 294. Lorenzo, nephew of Julian, tyranny, i. 294; Duke of Urbino, 373; death, *ib.* Giulio de', Cardinal, i. 374, 416, 419; elected Pope, 439. (*See* Clement VII.) Cosmo de', Grand Duke of Tuscany, i. 577, 601; ii. 107, 121, 265. Alessandro, i. 529, 561, 576 sq. Lorenzino, i. 576
Medici, Catherine de', birth, i. 374; marriage, 554; appointed Regent, ii. 91; domineered over by the Guises, 139; assumes the conduct of affairs, 149; negociates with the Hugonots, 166; trimming policy, 175; interview with Alva at Bayonne, 176; vacillating policy of, 204; plans the murder of Coligni, 207; policy after the massacre, 267; tries to murder La Noue and Damville, 273; Regent, 274; truce with the Hugonots, 275; interview with Henry of Navarre, 282; again at St. Bris, 336; death, 342
—, Mary de', Regent, ii. 428, 430, 456, 458; banished, 473; in Belgium, 587; in England, 601; death, *ib.*
—, John Gaston de', iii. 315, 525
Medicino, J. J., ii. 108
Medina Celi, Duke of, iii. 166
Mehemet Ali, in Egypt, iv. 580; interferes in Greece, 584; recalls Ibrahim, 585; attacks Syria, 609
Melanchthon, i. 390, 536, 538, 572, 590, 592; ii. 72
Melander, ii. 608 sqq.
Mélas, General, iv. 318, 336 sqq.
Mello, Don Francisco de, ii. 607, 615
Ménager, iii. 199, 201
Mendoza, Don Diego de, ii. 100
Ménéhould, Peace of, ii. 463
Menou, General, iv. 212, 303, 354
Menschikoff, Prince, favourite of the Czar Peter, iii. 233 sqq.; 329
—, Prince, iv. 656 sq.
Mentz, Elector of, opposes Louis XIV., iii. 85 sq.
Mercantile System, iii. 272
Merci, General, ii. 626
Mercœur, Duke of, ii. 353, 365
Mercuriale, what, ii. 137, *note.*
Mercy, Count de, iii. 196
Merino, iv. 569, 613
Merlin de Douai, iv. 275, 290, 315, 322
—, de Thionville, iv. 84, 169
Messina, revolt of, iii. 98
Metals, precious, increase of in Europe, ii. 17
Meteren, his character of the English, ii. 416
Methuen treaty, iii. 184
Metternich, Prince, iv. 479, 574, 632
Metz, obtained by the French, ii. 99
Mexico, conquest of, ii. 13
Meyer, Marcus, ii. 514 sq.
Michael Romanoff, Czar, ii. 521
—, Czar, iii. 41
—, King of Poland, iii. 109
Michelet, Monsieur, iv. 30
Michelozzi, i. 103
Mignons, ii. 277
Miguel, Don, revolts, iv. 572; usurps the throne of Portugal, 615; defeat and flight, 616
Milan, early history, i. 48; treaty of, 17, 97; iv. 268; decree, iv. 437
Milanese succession, claims to, after death of last Visconti, i. 49 sq.
Miltitz, Carl Von, i. 390 sqq.
Mina, General, iv. 567 sqq., 602 sq., 614

Minas, Das, Marquis, iii. 187 sqq.
Minorca, seized by the French, iii. 401
Minorites, scheme of an army of, i. 430
Minto, Lord, iv. 639, 646
Miollis, General, iv. 457
Mirabeau, Marquis, iv. 14
—, Count de, iii. 545, 547; character, iv. 55; supports the *Veto*, 58; plot of October 1789, 59, 62; his journal, 65; bought by the Court, 69 sq.; death, 72 sq.
Miranda, General, iv. 134, 566
Mir Capillo, iv. 566
Mississipi Company, iii. 296
Modena, Francis, Duke of, expelled, iv. 605
Moderados, iv. 568
Mohammed Ab'ul Berekeath, i. 3
Molé, President, iii. 5
—, Count, iv. 603, sqq., 622, 648
Moleville, Bertrand de, iv. 85, 87, 106, 114, 120
Moliterno, Prince, iv. 326
Mollas, what, i. 13
Möllendorf, Marshal, iii. 502; iv. 187, 214 sqq., 424 sq.
Monastic Orders, reform of, ii. 393; increase of, in Spain, 404
Moncada, Hugo de, i. 474, 484, 489
Moncey, Marshal, iv. 473 sqq.
Monçon, treaty of, ii. 536
Mondragone, ii. 369
Monge, iv. 104, 125
Mongelas, iv. 396
Monsieur, title of French king's brother, ii. 278
Montague, Sir Wortley, iii. 303
—, Admiral, iii. 62
Montalto, Cardinal, ii. 324
Montcalm, Marquis de, iii. 426 sq.
Monte Corona, Order of, ii. 9
Montebello, Duke de, iv. 608
—, treaty of, iv. 270
Montecuculi, iii. 94 sqq., 105 sq.
Montemar, Duke of, iii. 322 sq., 359, 373
Montespan, Madame de, iii. 137
Montesquieu, iv. 5, 16
Montesquiou, assassinates Condé, ii. 182
Montgomérj, Count, ii. 269
Montigny, Baron, executed, ii. 249
Montluc, Bishop of Valence, i. 605; ii. 270
—, Blaise de, i. 606; ii. 108, 163
Montmartre, camp at, iv. 48
Montmorenci, Constable, i. 578, 585 sqq.; ii. 57, 75, 92, 102, 116, 122, 128, 139, 150, 151, 165; killed, 180
Montmorenci (Damville), Duke of, joins the Hugonots, ii. 334
—, Charlotte de, ii. 453
Montmorin, M. de, iv. 70, 85, 106, 109
Montpellier, Peace of, ii. 524
Montpensier, Duke of, marries Maria Louisa of Spain, iv. 620
—, Duchess of, sister of Guise, ii. 337, 346
—, Madlle. de, commands at the Bastille, iii. 13; banished, 14
Moore, treaty of, i. 456
—, General Sir J., iv. 448, 454, 475, 478
Moors in Spain, i. 189; reduced to Granada, *ib.*; fall of their empire, 191
Moravian Brethren, iii. 286
Morea, its population, i. 76; name, *ib. note.*
Moreau, General, campaign of 1794, iv. 215 sqq.; commands the army of the Rhine, 1796, 238 sqq.; retreat, 252 sq.; 1797, 265; implicated in Pichegru's plot, 274; in Italy, 1799, 320 sqq.; commands on the Rhine, 1800, 336 sq.; plot against Bonaparte, 377; banished to America, 380; returns and joins the allies, 528; killed, 534
Morelly, Abbé, iv. 14
Morillo, General, iv. 567 sq.
Moriscoes, origin of the name, i. 248; persecuted by Philip II., ii. 287; revolt, 188, 443; expelled, 444
Mörner, Count, iv. 505
Morny, M. de, iv. 650
Morone, Jerome, i. 411, 416; conspiracy of, 467; arrested, 468
Morpeth, Lord, iv. 421
Mortemar, Duke de, iv. 590
Mortier, Marshal, iv. 374, 400, 440
Morvilliers, Pierre de, i. 131
Moscow burnt, iv. 517
Moulins, ordonnance de, ii. 179
Mounier, iv. 17, 45, 63
Mountain, party of the, iv. 113
Mufti, his office, i. 13
Muley Abul Hacen, Caliph, i. 190
— Hassan, i. 560 sq.
— Mahommed of Morocco, ii. 286
München Grätz, Congress at, iv. 616
Munn, Thomas, ii. 417
Münnich, Marshal, iii. 332 sqq., 352, 364, 443 sqq.
Muñoz, iv. 618
Münster, Bishop of, war with the Dutch, iii. 73
—, Congress at, ii. 623; peace between Spain and Holland, 632
Münzer, Thomas, i. 498 sqq.
Murad Bey, iv. 304, 330
Murat, iv. 291, 303, 330, 332, 401; marries Napoleon's sister, 413; becomes Grand Duke of Berg, *ib.*; Prussian campaign, 423 sqq.; in Spain, 463 sq.; becomes King of Naples as Joachim I., 470; attacks Sicily, 491; in Russia, 514 sqq.; defeated near Moscow, 518; sets off for Naples, 529; alliance with Austria, 539; attacks the Austrians, 554; flight, 555; executed, 573
Muretus, panegyric on the St. Bartholomew, ii. 219
Murillo, Bravo, iv. 655
Murray, Sir John, iv. 540
Muskets, introduction of, i. 304
Mustapha I., Sultan, ii. 503; restored, 505; deposed, *ib.*
— II., Sultan, iii. 114
— III., Sultan, iii. 458; war with Russia, *ib.*; defeat of his armies, 459; death, 469
— IV., Sultan, iv. 446; war with Russia, 503 sq.; dethroned, 580
— Bairactar, iv. 580
Muteferrika, Sultan's guard, i. 5

NACHIMOFF, Admiral, iv. 658
Nadasdy, Count, iii. 108
Nadasti, General, iii. 368, 377
Nantes, Carrier at, iv. 159
Napier, Admiral, iv. 660
Naples, pretenders to, i. 52; seized by France and Spain, 234 sq.; conquered by Gonsalvo, 243; insurrections at, ii. 64, 629
Napoleon I., reception at the Luxembourg, iv. 40; on the 20th June, 92; on 10th of August, 103; at Toulon, 157; dismissed, 230; project to enter the Turkish service, *ib.*; defends the Tuileries, 231; appointed to army of Italy, 239; marries Josephine, *ib.*; campaign in Piedmont, 240 sq.; at Lodi, 243; exactions in Italy, 244; threatens the Venetians, 245; enters Papal States, 246; seizes Leghorn, 247; at Arcole, 254; at Rivoli, 255; writes to the Emperor, 258; invades the Papal States, 260; Peace of Tolentino, *ib.*; enters the Noric Alps, 262; writes to the Archduke Charles, 263; armistice of Léoben, 264; letter to Doge of Venice, 265; declares war against that Republic, 266; tyrannical demands, 267; treaty of Milan, 268; establishes Cisalpine Republic, &c., 270; negociations with Directory, 273; at Udine, 275; interview with Cobentzl, 278; projects against England, 284; at Rastadt, 285; returns to Paris, 286; share in Swiss Revolution, 292 sqq.; at Rastadt, 297; threatens to resign, 302; sails for Egypt, 303; captures Malta, *ib.*; proves himself no Christian, 303; at Cairo, 328; Syrian expedition, 328; at Jaffa, 330; returns to France, *ib.*; at St. Cloud, 332; First Consul, 334; letter to George III., 336; crosses St. Bernard, *ib.*; re-establishes Cisalpine Republic, 337; concordat with Pius VII., 342; courts Paul I., 344; threatens to invade England, 355; Consul for life, 358; reduces St. Domingo, 361; interference in Germany, 363; in Switzerland, 366; annexes Piedmont, 368; treaty with Spain, 375; becomes Emperor, 379; coronation, 381; courts Frederick William III., 385; second letter to George III., 386; accepts the Lombard crown, 390; scene with Neapolitan ambassador, *ib.*; tyranny in Italy, 391; defeats Mack at Ulm, 398; at Austerlitz, 404 sq.; convention with Prussia, 406; seizes Naples, 411; reactionary measures in France, 413; erects Italian duchies, *ib.*; project of universal monarchy, 414; scatters the Prussians, 423 sqq.; at the tomb of Frederick the Great, 425; brutality towards Duke of Brunswick, 426; after battle of Eylau, 429 sq.; at Tilsit, 431; adopts the Continental System, 436; peace with Sweden, 449; despotism, 450; treatment of Spain, *ib.*; deposes the House of Braganza, 454; treatment of Pius VII., 455 sq.; annexes the Papal States, 457 sq.; Spanish plot, 459 sq.; offers his brother Louis the crown of Spain, 464; letter to Ferdinand, 466; receives the Spanish family at Bayonne, 467; at Erfurt, 475; in Spain, 477; defeats the Archduke Louis, 481; at Vienna, 483; excommunicated, 490; marries the Archduchess Maria Louisa, 492; oppression of Holland, 493; arbitrary annexations, 495; extent of his empire, 501; tyranny towards Sweden, 506 sq.; overtures to England, 510; birth of a son, 512; at Dresden, *ib.*; Russian campaign, 513 sqq.;

NAPOLEON
battle of Borodino, 516; enters Moscow, 517; retreat, 518 sqq.; quits his army, 520; appoints a Regency, 523; refuses all concession, 526; begins the German campaign, 529; at Leipsic, 535; retreat, 536; dismisses Ferdinand VII., 541; and Pius VII., *ib.*; joins his army, 542; defeated at Brienne, 543; deposed by the Senate, 544; abdicates, 545; proceeds to Elba, 546; lands at Cannes, 552; holds a *Champ de Mai*, 554; last campaign, 555 sq.; flight, 556; goes on board the Bellerophon, 557; at St. Helena, and death, 558
Napoleon II. (Duke of Reichstadt), proclaimed, iv. 557; death, 604
— III. (Charles Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, second son of Louis, King of Holland), takes part in the Italian insurrections, iv. 606; in Switzerland, 607; conspiracy of Strasburg, *ib.*; in America, 608; lands at Boulogne, 610; imprisoned at Ham, 611; elected deputy, 626; President, 627; designs to become Emperor, 618 sqq.; proclaimed as Napoleon III., 652; marriage, *ib.*; letter to Nicholas I., 658; visits London, 662
Narbonne Count de, iv. 85, 87, 120
Narvaez, General, iv. 618 sq., 654 sq.
Nassau, family of, ii. 228
—, John Maurice of, iii. 276
Navarre, kingdom of, i. 56
Navarro, Pedro, i. 282 sqq., 354, 474; death, 489
Navies, national, rise of, ii. 28, 423
Navigation, ocean, i. 311; Act, iii. 20
Naxos, duchy of, i. 79
Necker, Oliver, i. 152
—, minister of finance, iii. 521 sqq., 542 sqq.; iv. 17, 34; doubles the *Tiers Etat*, 35; his conduct examined, 36; royal session, 44; return, 53; financial schemes, 67; retires, 71
Nelson, Lord, iv. 304, 310, 312, 325, 349, 355, 385, 408
Nemours, Duke of, iv. 622 sq.
Nepomuk, St. John, ii. 499
Nérac, treaty of, ii. 283
Nesselrode, Count, iv. 663
Netherlands, trade of the, ii. 23; opulence and luxury of, 24; how composed, 221; constitution, 222; prosperity, 223; religion, *ib.*; *Consulta*, 225; new bishoprics, 226; coalition, 230; persecutions in, 232; the "Compromise," 234; emigration, 241
—, Austrian, revolt against Joseph II., reforms, iii. 483; revolution, 498; declare their independence, 499; reduced by Leopold, 504
—, Kingdom of the, iv. 561
Neuhaüsel, captured, iii. 106
Neuperg, Count, iii. 333, 334, 346, 355
Neutrality, Armed, iii. 529 sqq.; revived, iv. 344 sqq.
Ney, Marshal, command in the "Army of England," iv. 376; in Germany, 1805, 393, 399; in Prussian campaign, 1806, 423 sqq.; Russian campaign, 1807, 429 sq.; in Spain, 1808, 477 sqq.; in Russia, 1812, 514 sqq.; commands the rear-guard in the retreat, 520, 522; German campaign, 1813, 532 sq.; volunteers
NEYEN
against Napoleon, 553; joins him, *ib.*; at Quatre Bras, 555; shot, 563
Neyen, John, ii. 437
Nice, siege of, i. 604
Nicholas I., Czar, iv. 582; his Muscovitism, 583; declares war against the Porte, 585; crowned at Warsaw, 599; tyranny in Poland, 601; treaty with the Porte, 609; helps to subdue the Hungarians, 643; designs against Turkey, 656; interviews with Francis Joseph and Frederick William IV., 657; death, 661
— V., Pope, i. 18 sq.; crowns Frederick III., 29; summons a Congress, 51; publishes a crusade against the Turks, 81; death, 84; founder of Glasgow University, *ib.*, *note*.
— of Ujlak, i. 89, 92
Nicole, iii. 283
Nietard, Father, iii. 71, 86 sq.
Nikolsburg, Peace of, ii. 502
Nimeguen, Peace of, iii. 102
Nivernais, Duke de, iv. 230
Noailles, Cardinal de, iii. 289, 290
—, Duke de, iii. 154 sqq., 198, 369 sqq.
—, Viscount de, iv. 57
Nobles, French, their position, iv. 4, 6
Noces vermeilles, les, ii. 206
Noircarmes, ii. 244
Norfolk, Duke of, scheme to marry Mary, Queen of Scots, ii. 196 sq.; executed, 198
Norris, Sir John, ii. 301, 312, 321
North, Lord, iii. 536 sq.
Notables, Assembly of (1560), ii. 142; at Moulins, 178; (1787), iii. 543
Normandy, reannexed to France, i. 125
Norway, transferred to Sweden, iv. 538
Noyades, the, iv. 159
Noyon, treaty of, i. 365
Nuncios, what, i. 309
Nuremberg, Diet of, i. 504; Peace of, 546
Nymphenburg, treaty of, iii. 350
Nystadt, Peace of, iii. 254

OCHS, Peter, iv. 293, 295
Odescalchi, Benedict, iii. 141. (*See* Innocent XI.)
O'Donnell, Count of Abisbal, iv. 569, 636
Odysseus, iv. 581
Ogilvy, General, iii. 232 sq.
Oginski, iii. 226
Olden Barneveldt, ii. 321 sqq., 434 sqq., 477 sqq.
Oléron Jugemens d', ii. 27
Oliva, treaty of, iii. 64
Olivarez, Condé de, ii. 523, 602 sq., 615
Olivier de la Marche, i. 120
Olkioki, armistice, iv. 448
Oñate, ii. 579, 632
Opdam, Admiral, iii. 73
Opitz, Joshua, ii. 377
Oppède, Baron d', i. 614
Orange, Prince of, Viceroy of Naples, i. 489, 528; Prince and Princess fly to England, iv. 220
—, title of, ii. 228
Oratory of Divine Love, ii. 9
Orchan, i. 3
Oriflamme, last appearance, i. 122
Orleans, Philip, Duke of, iii. 295; Regent, 296; policy, 297; treaty
PARIS
with England, 304; war with Spain, 305; mischief of his government, iv. 32
Orleans, Duke of (*Egalité*), iii. 526; iv. 46, 48, 54, 59, 62, 63, 113, 114, 121, 152
—, Synod at, ii. 161
Orloff, Alexis, iii. 445, 460; iv. 197
—, Gregory, iii. 444 sq., 484
Ormond, Duke of, iii. 182, 201, 203
Ornano, d', Marshal, ii. 538
Orsini, legate, ii. 267 sq.
Orsino, Prince of Taranto, i. 100
Orthoghrul, or Ertoghrul, i. 2
Osborn, Admiral, iii. 417
Oscar, King of Sweden, iv. 634
Osman, or Othman, i. 2
— II., Sultan, ii. 503; expedition against Poland, 504; plans against the Janissaries, *ib.*; put to death, 505
— III., Sultan, iii. 458
Osmanlis, name whence derived, i. 2
Osnabrück, Congress at, ii. 623
Ossat, d', Cardinal, ii. 364
Ossuna, Duke d', plot, ii. 476
Ostermann, Baron, iii. 329, 330, 364
Otho I., King of Greece, iv. 586
Oudinot, Marshal, iv. 481, 514, 534, 646
Oxenstiern, Axel, ii. 520, 567; invested with the government, 576; consolidates the German alliance, 577; negociations with France, 589; his absolute power, 617
—, Eric, opposes the succession of Charles Gustavus, iii. 37, cf. 48, 128

PACHE, iv. 137, 168
Pacheco, Don Juan, i. 179
—, Donna Maria de, i. 405, 407
"Pacification of Ghent," ii. 263; dissolved, 305
Pacte de Famine, iii. 520; iv. 11, 32
Padilla, Don Juan de, i. 403 sqq.
Padishah, what, i. 9
Pagès, Garnier, iv. 623, 625
Paget, Sir Arthur, iv. 446
Pahlen, General, iv. 199
—, Von der, iv. 350 sq.
Paine, Thos., iii. 523; iv. 78, 125
Paix de Monsieur, ii. 278
Palacky, iv. 638
Palæologi, fate of the, i. 77
Palæologus, Andrew, bequeaths his imperial claims to Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, i. 77
Palafox, Joseph, iv. 471, 474
Palais Royal, iv. 48
Palatinate, reunited with Bavaria, iii. 474
Palatine, Hungarian, i. 33; his privileges, 197
Palli, Count Luchesi, iv. 604
Palm, the Bookseller, iv. 418
Palmerston, Lord, interferes in Spain, iv. 654; Premier, 661
Panin, Count, iii. 444, 463, 485, 532
Panis, iv. 30, 111, 112, 212
Paoli, General, iii. 508, sq.; iv. 223 sq.
Paolo Toscanelli, i. 316
Pappenheim, General, ii. 558, 564 sqq., 573 sqq., 588
Pardo, Convention of the, iii. 337
Paris, submits to Charles VII., i. 67; alarm at on capture of Francis I., 449; improved by Henry III., ii. 415; Peace of 1763, iii. 438; Capitulation of, iv. 544; First Peace of, iv. 547

PARIS
sq.; Second, 562; Congress of, 1856, iv. 663; Treaty of, *ib.*
Paris, Count de, iv. 622. 649
Parker, Admiral Sir Hyde, iv. 349 sq.
Parliament of Paris, i. 71, *note*; averse to the Lutherans, 450; dispute with Louis XV., iii. 406 sq.; suppressed, 510
Parliaments, French, abolished, iv. 68
Parma, origin of the Duchy, i. 618
— Duke of. (*See* Farnese, Alexander.)
Parthenon of Athens, injured, iii. 112
Parthenopean Republic, iv. 315
Parti Thermidorien, iv. 210
Pascal, Blaise, iii. 288
Pashalic, what, i. 12
Paskiewitsch, Prince, iv. 601, 644, 659
Pasquier, Baron, iv. 594
Passarowitz, Peace of, iii. 303
Passau, Peace of, ii. 94
Patkul, John Reinhold, iii. 129, 213 sqq., 232, 234
Pavanes, Jacques, burnt, i. 451
Paul Petrowitsch, iii. 443
— I., Czar, atonement to his father's ashes, iv. 197; view of the French Revolution, 306; patronises the Knights of Malta, 308; alliance with the Turks, 309; declares war against Spain, 324; withdraws from the Coalition, 327; discontent with England and Austria, 343; plans against England, 344; revives the Armed Neutrality, 347; death and character, 350
— II., Pope, i. 95; forms a league against the Turks, 96; his connection with Naples, 100; restores peace in Italy, 104; death, 105
— III., Pope, i. 558; excommunicates Henry VIII., *ib.*; at Nice, 575; matrimonial schemes, 577; renews the Bull against Henry, 580; calls a Council, 588; to meet at Trent, 611; makes his bastard son Duke of Parma, 618; reforms of, at Rome, ii. 11; allies himself with Henry II., 60, 62; death, 79
— IV., Pope, ii. 110; his violence, 111, 118; refuses to recognise the abdication of Charles V., 115; cites him and Philip II. to Rome, 118; attacked by Philip, 119; makes peace with him, 121; sanctions the Inquisition in France, 136; change of life, 145; increases the pomp of worship, 146; death, *ib.*; impolitic conduct, 392; savage bigotry, 399
— V., Pope, ii. 441; puts Venice under an interdict, 442; death, 523
Pauw, Pensionary, iii. 20
Payne, Peter, i. 329
Pays d'élection, iv. 10
Pays d'états, iv. 10
Pazzi, conspiracy of the, i. 107 sq.
Pechlin, General, iv. 199
Pecquigny, Peace of, i. 145
Pedro, Don, Regent of Portugal, iii. 68; peace with Spain, 79
— II. of Portugal, accedes to Grand Alliance, iii. 184; concludes the Methuen Treaty, *ib.*
— V. of Portugal, iv. 655
—, Don, Emperor of Brazil, iv. 672 sq.; grants the Portuguese a

PÉLISSIER
Charter, 615; abdicates in Brazil, 616; enters Lisbon, *ib.*; death, *ib.*
Pélissier, Marshal, iv. 661
Pellew, Admiral, Sir E., iv. 549, 578
Peloponnesus, i. 13
Peltier, iv. 369
Penn, Admiral, iii. 20, 23
Pepé, General, iv. 574
Pera or Galata, i. 14; submits to Mahomet II., 82
Pereira, Nuño Alvarez, i. 62
Pères de la foi, iv. 378
Perez, Don Antonio, ii. 307, 332 sq.
Périer, Casimir, iv. 588, 594, 603 sq.
Perron, Cardinal, ii. 364
Peru, conquest of, ii. 13
Pescara, Marquis, i. 289, 416, 440, 442, 445, 467
Peterborough, Earl of, iii. 189 sqq.
Peter the "Great," Czar, iii. 116; obtains Azof, *ib.*; accession, 215; plots against, *ib.*; marriage, 216; defeats the plots of his sister Sophia, *ib.*; reforms and journeys, *ib.*; at Riga and Berlin, 217; in Holland, *ib.*; in England, 218; introduces the Julian Calendar, 219; reforms, *ib.*; alliance against Sweden, 220; declares war against Charles XII., 223; flies from Narva, 224; treaty with Augustus II, 225; renewed, 232; captures Nyenschanz, 235; founds Petersburg, 236; invades Lithuania, *ib.*; defeats the Swedes at Liesna, 238; at Pultava, 240; enters Moscow in triumph, 243; invades Turkey, *ib.*; marriage with Catherine, 244; his perilous situation, *ib.*; letter to his Senate, *ib.*; makes the capitulation of the Pruth, 245; remarkable speech, 249; reconciles himself with Sweden, 250; concludes the Peace of Nystadt, 254; "Peter the Great," 255; Persian expedition, 326; death, 327; Political Testament, 328, *note*.
— II., Czar, iii. 328 sqq.
—, Grandduke, enters the service of Frederick II., iii. 402; admiration of that monarch, 412; ascends the Russian throne, 433. (*See* Peter III.)
— III., Czar, makes peace with Frederick II., iii. 433; deposed, 434, 444; character, 442; murdered, 445
— the Lame, i. 76
— Martyr, ii. 153
Pétion, iv. 76, 84, 91, 92, 94, 97, 99, 102, 105, 107, 111, 142, 153
Petitioners, Parisian, iv. 38
Petits Maîtres, the, iii. 9
Petrowitsch, George, iv. 444
Peyronnet, M., iv. 603
Pfahlbürger, burgesses of the Pale, i. 26
Pfeiffer, monk, i. 509
Phanariots, i. 76, and *note*
Philip the Good, Duke of Burgundy, i. 65; power and splendour, 66; shelters the Dauphin Louis, i. 113; joins the League against Louis XI., 121; death, 126
— I. of Spain, i. 252
— II. of Spain (as Infant), visits Germany, ii. 76; his haughtiness, *ib.* and *note*; project to make him Emperor, 82; marries Queen Mary, 104; made King of Naples, 105; arrives in England, *ib.*; share in the religious persecutions, 106; receives the sove-

PHILIP
reignty of the Netherlands and Spain, 113; character, 114; makes war on the Pope, 119; interferes in government of England, 122; vow to St. Lawrence, 123; marries Elizabeth of France, 135, 145; indirectly supports Protestantism in England, 140; returns to Spain, 144; rejects the Anti-Protestant plot of the Guises, 145; incites Catherine de' Medici against the Hugonots, 156; persecutes the Moors, 187; joins the Holy League against the Turks, 194; joins a plot to murder Queen Elizabeth, 198; delight at the massacre of St. Bartholomew, 219; proceedings in the Netherlands, 224, 232, 237; his authority restored, 240, 241; condemns all the Netherlanders to death, 245; reply to Maximilian, 246; seeks the imperial crown, 266; conquers Portugal, 288; offers to support Henry of Navarre, 292; treaty with Guise, 295; jealousy of Don John, 303; proscribes Orange, 307; hires an assassin to murder him, 313; war with England, 321; pretends to the English crown, 327; schemes, *ib.*; abandons the war in the Netherlands, 331; orders the assassination of Escovedo, 332; deprives the Aragonese of their privileges, 333; designs upon France, 349; connection with the French democracy, *ib.*; proposals to the League, 358; peace with Henry IV., 374; abdicates the sovereignty of the Netherlands in favour of his daughter, 375; death and character, *ib.*; effects of his reign, 376; succeeded in suppressing Protestantism, 398
Philip III. of Spain, character, ii. 433; marriage, *ib.*; makes advances to Henry IV., 439; makes peace with the Dutch, *ib.*; supports the Archduke Ferdinand, 484; assists him as Emperor, 496; dies of etiquette, 523
— IV. of Spain, accession, ii. 523 deceives the French, 545; domestic policy, 602; heads his army, 612; dismisses Olivarez, 615; takes Monçon, 616; besieges Lerida, 627; ill state of his affairs, 629; peace with the Dutch, 632; offers his daughter's hand to Louis XIV., iii. 32; meets his sister Anne of Austria, 34; dissatisfied with Louis XIV., 68; question of precedence with France, 70; death, *ib.*
—, Duke of Anjou, iii. 167; declared King of Spain, 173. (*See* Philip V.)
— V. of Spain, character, iii. 173; marries Louisa Gabriella of Savoy, 175; attempts to recover Barcelona, 190; flies from Madrid, *ib.*; abolishes *the Fueros* of Aragon, 193; flies to Valladolid, 198; renounces his claims to France, 203; recognised by England, &c., 204; second marriage, 293; characteristics, 294; hatred of the Regent Orleans, 297; war with the Emperor, 301; accedes to Quadruple Alliance, 306; abdicates, 308; returns, 309; reconciled with the Emperor, *ib.*; guarantees the Pragmatic Sanc-

tion, 310; secret treaty with the Emperor, 311; complaints against England, 336; treaty with France, 337; claims on Austria, 350; supports Bavaria, *ib.*; treaty of Fontainebleau; 371; death, 385
Philip, Archduke, betrothed to Joanna of Spain, i. 219; obtains Guelderland and Zutphen, 246; proclaimed King of Castile, 248; associates Ferdinand in the Government, 250; detained by Henry VII., *ib.*; interview with Ferdinand, 251; death, 252
—, Don, Infant, iii. 371 sqq.
—, Landgrave of Hesse, i. 399; opposes the Anabaptists, 510; founds League of Torgau, 514; interview with Charles V. at Augsburg, 537; concludes a separate league, 542; defeats King Ferdinand at Laufen, 569; treaty with the Emperor, 591; bigamy, 592; put under imperial ban by Charles V., ii. 38; retreats, 43; before the Emperor at Halle, 49; detained a captive, 51; implores pardon, 70; liberated, 98
— William of Neuburg, Elector Palatine, iii. 144
Philipists, ii. 452
Philippa, daughter of Henry IV., marries Eric of Denmark, ii. 506
Phœbus, King of Navarre, i. 294
Physiocrates, iv. 13
Piast dynasty expires, i. 34
Picards, ii. 447
Piccolomini, General, ii. 579 sqq., 593, 608
Pichegru, General, iv. 163; on 9th *Thermidor*, 212; campaigns of 1794, 1795, 215 sqq.; in Holland, 219 sq.; on the Rhine, 234; corresponds with Condé, 235; opposes the Directory, 271 sq.; proscribed, 274; plot against Bonaparte, 377; strangled in prison, *ib.*
Pico di Mirandola, i. 338
Pierre, Jacques, ii. 477
Pietists, iii. 285
Pignatelli, Prince, iv. 314
Pilnitz, declaration of, iv. 81
Pinzon, Vicente, i. 313
—, Martin Alonso, i. 318
Piombino, principality of, iv. 342
Piper, Count, iii. 221 sqq.
—, Countess, iv. 505
Piracy, frequency of, ii. 26, 417
Pisa, sold to the Florentines by Louis XII. and Ferdinand I., i. 265
—, Council of, i. 281 sqq., 327
Pisseleu, Anne de, i. 469
Pistoia, propositions of, iii. 500
Pitt (father of Lord Chatham), iii. 300
—, William, iii. 506; declines to intercede for Louis XVI., iv. 123; pacific policy, 127; "enemy of human race," 148; subsidizes Austria, 236; proposes a peace, 257; resigns, 355; returns to power, 384; obtains a grant of five millions, 387; plan of a Coalition, *ib.*; death, 408; estimate of his policy, *ib.*
Pitti, Luca, i. 102; palace, *ib. note*, 103
Pius II., Pope (*see* Æn. Sylvius), calls a council at Mantua, i. 92; his letter to Mahomet II., *ib.*; joins an alliance against the Turks, 93; death, 95
Pius III., Pope, i. 239
— IV., Pope, ii. 146, 156, 168; reassembles Council of Trent, 170; death, 177
— V., Pope, ii. 177; character and views, 178; violence against the Hugonots, 182, 183; forms the Holy League, 194; machinations against Queen Elizabeth, 196; excommunicates and deposes her, 197; plots her assassination, *ib.*; death, 205, 238, 242
— VI., Pope, visits Vienna, iii. 476; threatens to excommunicate Bishop Ricci, 500; character, iv. 207; treaty with Bonaparte, 246; prepares for war, 260; concludes the Peace of Tolentino, *ib.*; deposed, 289; banishment and death, 290
— VII., Pope, iv. 342; Concordat with France, 360; winks at German secularisations, 365; attends Napoleon's coronation, 381; accedes to Continental System, 455; disputes with Napoleon, 456; excommunicates him, 490; a captive at Fontainebleau, 491; Concordat with Napoleon, 523; dismissed from captivity, 541; in Rome, 573; death, 578
— VIII., Pope, iv. 603; death, 605
— IX., Pope, iv. 635; liberal policy, 636; grants a Constitution, 638; flies from Rome, 645; deposed, *ib.*; returns, 655; establishes the Immaculate Conception, 656
Pizarro, Francisco, ii. 13
"Placards" (edicts of Charles V.), ii. 223
Platoff, iv. 522
Plessis, Praslin du, iii. 10
Podiebrad, George, defeats Albert of Bohemia, i. 33; Regent of Bohemia, 36, 83; accused of poisoning Ladislaus Posthumus, 88; elected King of Bohemia, 89; liberates Frederick III., 90; imprisons the Papal legate, 193; deposed by Paul II., *ib.*; invades Austria, *ib.*; alliance with Casimir, 195; death, *ib.*
Poischwitz, Armistice, iv. 532
Poissy, Conference at, ii. 153
Poland, early history, i. 34; state under John Casimir II., iii. 39 sq.; war of succession, 316; described by Frederick II., 318; state of, 451; partition of, predicted, 452; obtains a Russian Constitution, 455; anarchy, 458; entered by the Austrians and Prussians, 462; partition of, determined, 463; treaty for division of, 465 sq.; new Constitution, 467; second partition, iv. 180 sqq.; insurrection, 181; Constitution of May 3rd, 183; fresh insurrection, 190; third partition, 195; declared re-established, iv. 514; insurrection, 600; a Russian province, 601
Poles, their learning and tolerance, ii. 271
Pole, Cardinal Reginald, i. 580; ii. 103 sq.; 116
—, de la, Duke of Suffolk, killed, i. 447
Polignac, Cardinal de, iii. 305; iv. 19
—, Duke de, iv. 52
—, Prince Jules de, iv. 586
Politiques, the, ii. 203, 272
Political economy, ii. 416
Poltrot, ii. 165 sq.
Pombal, Marquis, his reforms, iii. 435 sq.; 512 sqq.; iv. 22
Pompadour, Madame de, iii. 389, 396, 399, 507, 511, 514
Pomponne, iii. 81, 90
Ponce de Leon, i. 323, 340
Poniatowski, Count, iii. 243 sqq.
—, Stanislaus, iii. 448, and *note*; elected King of Poland, 450. (*See* Stanislaus Augustus.)
—, Prince, iv. 481, 535
—, Joseph, iv. 186, 194
Pontoise, Parliament at, iii. 14
Popes, dominions of the; in 15th century, i. 38; how elected, 41; jurisdiction of, abrogated in England, 557; decrease of their temporal power, ii. 12; claimed islands and undiscovered lands, 312; rise of their power, 324 sq.; schism, 327
Porcari, Stefano, i. 38
Portland, Duke of, iii. 540; iv. 441
Portocarrero, Cardinal, iii. 168 sqq.; 190
Port Royal, ii. 393; iii. 209, 287, and *note*; 289
Portsmouth, Duchess of, iii. 82
Portugal, early history, i. 61; under Emanuel I. and John III., ii. 285; claimants to the crown on death of Sebastian, 287; conquered by Philip II., 288; revolts from Spain, ii. 605; colonies, iii. 273; treaties for dividing, iv. 453; conquered by the French, 461
Portuguese, conquests of the, ii. 14, 15
Potemkin, Prince, iii. 484 sqq., 496, 505 sq., 531
Potocki, iii. 45 sqq.
—, Felix, iv. 183 sqq.
—, Ignatius, iv. 180, 190 sqq.
Potter, De, iv. 595 sq.
Power, balance of, iii. 266
Pradt, De, iv. 514
Præmunire, statute, i. 327
Pragmatic Sanction of St. Louis, i. 332; Austrian, iii. 310
Prague, Peace of, ii. 590
Praguerie, la, i. 72
Presburg, treaty of, i. 200
—, Peace of, iv. 406
Pretender, attempted descent, iii. 194; in 1715, 210, 297; in 1745, 380
Prices, sudden rise of, ii. 22
Prie, Madame de, iii. 309
Prierias, Silvester, i. 387, 389
Printing, effects of, i. 337
Pritchard, Mr., iv. 611
Privilege of Union, Aragonese, i. 61
Prokop, the Great and the Little, i. 32
Pronunciamentos, iv. 618
Propaganda, the, ii. 402
"Protestants," origin of the name, i. 533; object to Council of Trent, 612; divisions among, ii. 170
Protestant Union (1608), ii. 449, 482; dissolved, 499
Protestantism, progress of, ii. 392; crushed in Spain, 399; uprooted in Bohemia, 498
Provence, annexed to France, i. 156
—, Count de, iii. 541; iv. 85; accused, 86; Manifesto, 99; Regent, 146; reception by the Venetians, 208. (*See* Louis XVIII.)
Provisors, statute, i. 327
Pruth, Capitulation of the, iii. 245

PRUSSIA
Prussia, Ducal, i. 512
—, a Kingdom, iii. 177 sq.; a European Power, 269
Public peace, or *Landfriede*, i. 25
Pugatscheff, Russian Pretender, iii. 470
Puisaye, Mary de, iv. 227
Pulteney, Earl of Bath, iii. 368
Purgatory, doctrine of, established, i. 325
Puyravaux, iv. 589
Pyrénees, treaty of the, iii. 33

QUARTIANS, iii. 45, 49
Quesnay, iv. 13
Quesnel, iii. 210, 288 sq.
Quietists, iii. 290
Quosdanovich, General, iv. 253

RABAUT, ST. ETIENNE, iv. 84, 142, 153
Radetzki, Marshal, iv. 636 sq., 639 sq., 643
Radom, Confederation of, iii. 454
Radzejowski, Jerome, iii. 41, 44
Radziejowski, Cardinal-Primate, iii. 226 sqq.
Radzivill, Prince, ii. 270; iii. 41, 45
—, Charles Stanislaus, 230, 454 sqq.
Raglan, Lord, iv. 659, 661
Ragotski, attacks Austria, ii. 622; iii. 52, 54, 104
—, Francis, iii. 183, 187
—, Joseph, 332
Rainer, Archduke, iv. 636
Raleigh, Sir Walter, ii. 371, 417
Ramus, ii. 156; massacred, 211
Rapin, iii. 141
Raspail, iv. 625, 627, 648
Rastadt, Peace of, iii. 207
—, Congress of, iv. 285, 308 sq.
Ratisbon, meeting of anti-reformers at, i. 506; Diet, i. 590; ii. 33
—, Conference at, ii. 32
—, Diet of, complement to the Peace of Westphalia, iii. 27
Ravaillac, ii. 457
Raynal, *Abbé*, iii. 394; iv. 22 sq.
Reason, worship of, iv. 154
Recamier, Madame, iv. 211
Reding, Aloys, iv. 366
Red Republic, iv. 625
Reformation, in Germany, i. 386 sq.; in Switzerland, 400; political character of the, 513; opposition to, *ib.*; causes of its success in Germany, ii. 3; in Switzerland, 4; its political effects, 7; essentially Teutonic, 8; in England, *ib.*; in the Romish Church, 9; growing political character, 134; in France, 135, 137; at Naples, 100; in Spain, 144 sq.; consequences of, iii. 262, 283
Régale, the, iii. 141
Regnier, General, iv. 412
Rehnskiöld, General, iii. 233 sqq.
Reichenbach, negociations of, iii. 502; Convention of, 503
Reichs-Kammer-Gericht, or Supreme Tribunal of the Empire, i. 257
Reichstadt, Duke of. (*See* Napoleon II.)
Reis Effendi, what, i. 12
Relazioni, Venetian, i. 43
Religious Peace, ii. 112
Remonstrants, ii. 478
Renaudie, La, ii. 141
Renault de Nevers, ii. 477
Rénault, Cécile, iv. 171
Rendsborg, Convention of, iii. 123

RENÉ
René d'Anjou, i. 52, 55
— II., Duke of Lorraine, i. 146; recovers Nanci, 149 sq.
Renée, consort of Hercules II. of Ferrara, i. 488
Repnin, Prince, iii. 453 sqq., 496, 505 sq.; iv. 194, 307
Requesens, Don Louis de, ii. 195; governor of the Netherlands, 257; his fleet defeated, 258; death, 262
Reservation, right of, i. 40; ecclesiastical, ii. 112
Retz, Cardinal de, coadjutor, iii. 6; bargains for a cardinal's hat, 11; obtains it, 14; arrested and banished, 15
Reventlow, Count, iv. 647
Revolution, French, character of, iv. 3; state of France before, 10 sq.; influence of literature, 15 sqq.; of Rousseau, 29 sqq.; compared with English Revolution, 41; *National* Assembly, 44; oath in Tennis Court, 45; union of the orders, 46; *Constituent* Assembly, 54; debates, 56; abolishes privileges, &c., 57; its labours, 58; transferred to Paris, 63; Committee of Constitution, 67; Act of the Constitution, 81; closed, 83; *Legislative* Assembly, 84; decree against the Princes, 86; insurrection of June 20th, 1792, 91; of August 10th, 101 sq.; massacres of September, 108 sqq.; the *Convention*, 113 sqq.; abolishes royalty, 114; condemns the King to death, 120 sq.; insolent decrees, 124; arrests the Bourbons, 137; Commission of Twelve, 138; Central Club, 140; Reign of Terror, 150; the *chemises rouges*, 171; 9th *Thermidor*, 173; *Convention* closed, 232; state of France, *ib.*; Councils of *Five Hundred* and *Ancients*, 228; altered, 275; turned out by Bonaparte, 332 sq.
Reuchlin, i. 338
Rewbel, iv. 231 sq., 271 sqq., 283, 302, 315, 322
Rhé, Isle of, expedition to, ii. 541
Rhine, Electoral Union of the, i. 377
Rhode of Königsberg, iii. 263
Rhodes, Knights of, i. 429; reduced by Solyman I., 430; retire to Malta, *ib.*
Riario, Jerome, i. 107, 110
Ribeiro, Pinto, ii. 605
Ricci, the Jesuit, ii. 401
—, General of the Jesuits, iii. 515, 516, 518
—, Scipio, Bishop of Pistoia, iii. 500
Richard III. of England, defeated, i. 162
Richelieu, Cardinal, account of, ii. 463; appears in the States-General, 464; Grand Almoner, 466; Secretary of State, 467; different views of his conduct, *ib.*; follows Mary de' Medici in her exile, 473; a spy upon her, 475; becomes Cardinal, 524; prime minister, 525; anti-Austrian policy, 526; arranges the marriage of Henrietta, *ib.*; seizes the Valteline, 529; borrows English vessels, 532; makes peace with the Hugonots, 535; opposed by the Catholics, *ib.*; summons an Assembly of Notables, 536; dexterous policy, 537; conspiracy against him, 538; belief in judicial astrology, *ib.*; destroys all castles,

RODOLPH
539; appointed Admiral, *ib.*; besieges La Rochelle, 543; his liberality, 545; treaty with Sweden, 556; reduces the Hugonots, 560; invades Italy as generalissimo, 561; intrigues against him, 563; German policy, 568; schemes against the Emperor, 586; plans to extend the French frontier, *ib.*; establishes the Parliament of Austrasia, *ib.*; treaty with the Dutch, 588; with the Swedes, 589; negociations with England, 600; connection with the Covenanters, 601; machinations against Charles I., *ib.*; interference in Spain, 602; plot of Cinq Mars and others, 611; journey to Paris, 612; death and character, 613; domestic policy, iv. 4 sq.; opinions respecting, 5; *Testament politique*, *ib.*, 15
Richelieu, Duke of, ii. 631
—, Marshal, Duke of, iii. 401 sqq., 411 sqq.
—, Duke of, iv. 504
Richemont, Count, i. 118
Ridolfi, ii. 197 sq.
Riego, Colonel, iv. 567 sqq.
Rieux, Marshal de, i. 166
Rincon, i. 582, 597
Ripaille, Convent of, i. 331
Ripperda, Baron, iii. 309, 311
Rivers, Earl, executed, i. 133
Roberjot, iv. 307, 319
Robespierre, in the Constituent, iv. 55; opposes a republic, 78; self-denying ordinance, 83; accused, 88; struggle with the Girondists, 91; address to the Assembly, 96; aims to become Dictator, 98; joins the *Commune*, 104; proposes a National Convention, 105; invokes the Reign of Blood, 106; share in the massacres, 111; Parisian deputy, 113; speech against Louis XVI., 118; opposes an appeal to the people, 120; organises the overthrow of the Gironde, 139; constitutional labours, 144; denounces Custine, 146; enters the Committee of Public Welfare, 147; reforms the Criminal Tribunal, 149; denounces the Atheists, 155; proposes a "Committee of Justice," 165; defends himself against the charge of *moderantisme*, 166, speech against Danton, 167; decrees a Supreme Being, 168; his law of 22nd *Prairial*, 169; breaks with the Committee of Public Welfare, 170; plots against him, 172; speech in the Convention, 173; arrested, 174; attempts an insurrection, 175; wounded, 176; executed, 177; character, *ib.*
—, Augustine, iv. 158, 174, 176
Rochambeau, Marshal, iv. 86 sqq.
Rochelle, la, privileges granted by Louis XI. to, i. 40; Hugonots at, ii. 268; siege (1573), 269 sq. (1628), 543
Rockingham, Marquis, iii. 536
Rocroi, Peace of, i. 138
Rodney, Admiral, iii. 420, 529, 535
Rodolph of Habsburg, i. 27
—, II., Emperor, ii. 266; mediates in the Netherlands, 299; his character, 376 sq.; persecutes the Protestants, 377; war with the Turks, 384; transactions with Sigismund of Transylvania, 387; peace with the Turks, 388; addiction to astronomy, 445; de-

ROE

cleared insane, 446; coerced by his brother Matthias, *ib.*; issues the *Majestäts Brief*, 447; conduct in the question of Juliers, 451 sq.; wretched administration, 480; coerced at Prague, *ib.*; deposed, 481; death, *ib.*
Roe, Sir Thomas, ii. 400, 505, 620
Roger du Nord, iv. 650
Rohan, Cardinal de, iii. 468, 541
— Duke de, ii. 523 sq., 530, 560
Roland, iv. 87, 90, 104, 109, 153
—, Madame, iv. 87, 152
Rollin, Ledru, iv. 620 sqq., 648
Romagna, boundaries of, i. 38
Romana, Marquis de la, iv. 442, 447, 474
Romans, King of the, i. 20, 21
Roman Catholic Church, reaction in favour of, ii. 393
Romanoff, House of, ii. 521
Romanzoff, iii. 459
Rome, last imperial coronation at, i. 29; threatened by the Turks, 80; League of, 431; taken by Bourbon, 480; decline of its prosperity, ii. 13; insurrection at, iv. 288; Republic, 289; entered by the Neapolitans, &c., 326; seized by Napoleon, 490; declared the second city of the French Empire, 491; King of, 512; a Republic, 645; captured and occupied by the French, 646
Roncaglia, Diet of, iii. 270
Rooke, Admiral, iii. 158, 182, 187
Roskild, treaty of, iii. 58
Rossi, Count, iv. 644 sq.
Rostoptchin, Count, iv. 517
Rota Romana, i. 40
Rovere, Julian della, i. 105, 239; becomes Popé, 240. (*See* Julius II.)
Rouarie, Marquis de la, iv. 132
Rousseau, J.J., iii. 509; iv. 16, 23 sq.; his *Contrat Social*, 24 sqq.
Roxolana, ii. 192
Rucellai, Abbé, ii. 475
Ruel, Peace of, iii. 7.
Ruffin, iv. 309, 310
Ruffo, Cardinal, iv. 325, 411
Rumbold, Sir G., iv. 377
Rupert, Prince, ii. 600
Russell, Admiral, iii. 156, 160
Russia, English commerce with, ii. 418; as a European Power, iii. 65, 269
Ruvigni, iii. 99
Ruy Gomez, ii. 332
Ruyter, De, iii. 20, 63, 67, 72, 88, 93, 98
Ryhove, ii. 304
Rymenants, battle, ii. 302
Ryswick, Peace of, iii. 162; its effects, 164
Rzewuski, iv. 183, 184

SAAVEDRA, Don Francisco, iv. 300
Sachs, Hans, i. 393
Sackville, Lord George, iii. 420
Sacramentaries, i. 402, 535
Sadolet, Bishop of Carpentras, i. 614
Sadoleto, Jacopo, i. 342
Saez, Victor, iv. 571
Sahim Gherai, iii. 485
Saim, what, i. 4
St. Arnaud, Marshal, iv. 652, 660
St. Cyr, Gouvion, General, iv. 291, 376, 477, 516, 537
St. Cyran, iii. 287
St. François de Sales, ii. 393
St. Geneviève, relics of, burnt, iv. 155
St. George Chevalier de, iii. 372, 380

ST. GEORGE

St. George, Chamber of, ii. 19
St. Germain, Peace of, i. 184
St. Huruge, iv. 92
St. Iago, Order of, i. 60
S. Ildefonso, treaties of, iv. 256, 341
St. John, iii. 199
— —, Knights of, i. 79; iv. 301 sqq., 357
St. Just, iv. 118, 147, 151, 163 sqq., 172 sqq., 216
St. Maur des Fosses, treaty of, i. 124
St. Petersburg, founded, iii. 236
St. Pierre, Abbé de, iv. 16
St. Pol, Constable, i. 125; beheaded, i. 146
— —, Count de, i. 494
St. Priest, Count, iv. 300
St. Simonism, iv. 621
St. Stephen, crown of, i. 522 and *note*.
St. Vincent, Lord, iv. 284
Salamanca, Concord of, i. 250
Salcède, conspiracy, ii. 291
Salicetti, iv. 157, 158, 246
Salm, Nicholas von, i. 525
Salmeron, the Jesuit, ii. 394
Salzmann, iv. 201
Samson, Bernhardin, i. 401
Sand, German student, iv. 577
Sandjak, what, i 12
Sandomir, Confederation of, iii. 228; renewed, 241
San Gallo, Marquis, iv. 264, 271, 311
San Marino, Republic of, iv. 261
San Roque, lines of, iii. 314
San Sacramento, iii. 512
Sans-culottes, iv. 138
Santa Coloma, Viceroy of Catalonia, ii. 602 sq.
Santa Junta, or Holy League in Spain, i. 403; depose the Regent Adrian, 404
Santerre, iv. 92, 99, 101, 122
Sapieha, Polish noble, iii. 226
Saporogue Cossacks, iii. 239 and *note*
Saratoga, capitulation of, iii. 525
Sardinia, Kingdom of, iii. 306
Sarpi, Fra Paolo, persuades the Venetians to recognise Henry IV., ii. 349; his anti-papal tenets, 441
Sarsfeld, General, iv. 613
Satyre Ménippée, ii. 362
Savary, Duke of Rovigo, intrigues in Spain, iv. 465 sqq.
Savonarola, i. 206; reorganises the Florentine Republic, 214; interview with Charles VIII., *ib.*; sends troops to Pisa, 219; contest with the Pope, 220, 222; burnt, 223
Savoy, made a duchy, i. 52; occupied by the French, iv. 117
Saumarez, Admiral, iv. 448
Saunders, the Jesuit, ii. 397
Saxe, Marshal, iii. 373 sq. 382 sqq.
— Teschen, Duke of, iv. 96, 116, 219
Saxon "Blood Order," ii. 594
Saxony, different Houses of, i. 22
—, Duchy of, becomes Protestant, 589
—, religious disputes in, ii. 451
—, a Kingdom, iv. 429
Scanderbeg, i. 19, 96, 101
Scarron, iii. 137
Scharnhorst, General, iv. 525, 530
Schaumburg, Silvester von, i. 393
Scheldt, the, closed, ii. 633; disputes about, iii. 477
Schenck, Colonel, ii. 330
Scheremeteff, Marshal, iii. 224, 235 sqq

SCHÉRER

Schérer, General, iv. 218, 235, 239, 275, 317, 320
Schertlin of Burtenbach, ii. 37 sq., 87
Schill, Major, iv. 489
Schiller, iv. 201
Schimmelpenninck, M., iv. 356, 368
Schinner, Bishop of Sion, i. 272
Schleswic, iii. 59; account of that duchy, iv. 630, 647; treaty of 1852, 654
Schlich, Count, iii. 183
Scholastic Philosophy, i. 336
Schomberg, Marshal, ii. 542, 634; iii. 99, 152
Schönbrunn, Peace of, iv. 485
Schonen, Von, iv. 590 sqq.
Schuhmacher, Peter, iii. 120, 123
Schulenburg, Baron, iii. 231 sqq.; 305, 359, 383 sqq.
Schwartz, Barthold, i. 302
Schwarzenberg, Prince, iv. 396, 483, 526, 533, 562
Schweedt, Convention, iii. 242
Schwerin, Marshal, iii. 346, 347, 410
Scotland, persecutions in, i. 616; French and English parties in, ii. 77
Scultetus, ii. 489, 494
Seadeddin, ii. 383, 386
Sebastian of Portugal, ii. 105, 285; expedition to Morocco, 286
Sebastiani, Colonel, iv. 370, 497 sq.
Seckendorf, Count, iii. 333, 358, 376 sq.
Sections, Parisian, iv. 69
Segedin, Peace of, i. 17
Séguier, Advocate-General, iii. 511
Ségur, Count de, iii. 525; iv. 85
Seigneur, title of, iv. 70
Selbig von Frauenstein, i. 301
Selim I., conquers Egypt, i. 3, 369; death, 373
— II., Sultan, ii. 192; expedition against Cyprus, 193; death, 195; effect of his wars, 424
— III., Sultan, iii. 496, 309, 310; breach with Russia, 444; deposed, 446
Seni, ii. 583
Senlis, truce of, i. 172
Sens, massacre at, ii. 161
Sepulveda, Colonel, iv. 572
Sergent, iv. 30, 112, 212
Serra, Anthony, ii. 17 *note*, 416
Serrurier, Marshal, iv. 240 sq., 321, 332
Servan, iv. 104
Servia, a Turkish province, i. 91
Servetus, burnt, ii. 136
"Seven Towers," the, ii. 424
Seven Years' War, iii. 395
Sforza, Francis, i. 48; marries the daughter of the Duke of Milan, 49; obtains Milan, 51; death, 103
—, Francesco Maria, i. 417; evacuates Milan, 443; reinstated, 467; treaty with Charles V., death, 562
—, Galeazzo Maria, i. 103; his vices, 106; assassinated, *ib.*
—, John Galeazzo, i. 106, 110
—, Ludovico, il Moro, i. 106; seizes the Government of Milan, 100, 179; invites Charles VIII. into Italy, *ib.*; becomes Duke of Milan, 206; flight, 228; capture, 229; confined at Loches, 230
—, Maximilian, proclaimed Duke of Milan, i. 291; driven out, 343; abdicates in favour of Francis I., 356

Sheik-ol-Islam, i. 13
Shelburne, Lord, iii. 536, 537, 540
Shovel, Sir Cloudesley, iii. 189, 194
Siawusch, Pasha, iii. 112 sq.
Sibylla of Clèves, i. 582
—, wife of John Frederick of Saxony, ii. 47
Sicily, Kingdom of, i. 58; Constitution of, iv. 206
Sickingen, Franz von, i. 301, 393 sqq., 408, 501 sq.
Sidney, Sir P., 321 sq.
Siennese, the, devastated by Cosmo de' Medici, ii. 108
Sievers, iv. 189
Sieyès, Abbé, iii. 547; iv. 45, 64, 67, 231, 274, 308, 322, 331, 334
Sigismund of the Tyrol, i. 130
— I. of Poland, i. 361, 512, 522
— II. of Poland, death, ii. 270
— III. of Poland, ii. 380, 486, 495, 503, 506, 517 sq., 593
Silesian War, Second, iii. 376
Silvio Pellico, iv. 576
Simmern, House of, ii. 461
Simonetta, Ciecco, i. 106
Simpson, General, iv. 661
Sinan Pasha, ii. 383 sq.
Sinclair, Major, iii. 362
Siniavin, Admiral, iv. 446, 454, 475
Sipahis, or Spahis, i. 4
Sistovo, Peace of, iii. 503
Sitvatorok, Peace of, ii. 388
"Sixteen," Council of, ii. 294, 337, 343, 349, 353 sq.
Sixtus IV., Pope, i. 105; nepotism, *ib.*; league with Ferdinand of Naples, 107; decisions against the Medici, *ib.*; places Florence under an interdict, 109; excites an insurrection at Genoa, *ib.*; his proceedings in Switzerland, *ib.*; league with Venice, 110; pardons the Florentines, 111; league with Milan, &c., 111; avarice and ambition, 174; death 175
Sixtus V., Pope, ii. 325, his plans and character, *ib.*; behaviour towards Queen Elizabeth, *ib.*; treaty with Philip II., 326; excommunicates Henry of Navarre and Condé, 335; refuses to aid the League, *ib.*; cites Henry III. to Rome for the murder of Guise, 344; sanctions his assassination, 346; death, 352
Slawata, William, ii. 484 sq.
Slobosia, armistice, iv. 446
Smalcald, League of, i. 542; Articles of, 570; League of, prepares to oppose Charles V., ii. 37
Smalcaldic war, ii. 38
Smith, Sir Sidney, iv. 158, 329, 330, 353, 385, 454
—, Spencer, iv. 377
Sobieski, John, King of Poland, iii. 109; relieves Vienna, *ib.*; captures Gran, 110; death, 114
—, James, iii. 230
Soderini, Gonfalonier of Florence, i. 292; deposed, 293
Soissons, Congress at, iii. 313
Soltikoff, iii. 443
Solyman I., Sultan, accession, i. 426; war with Hungary, 427; takes Belgrade, 428; takes Rhodes, 430; invades Hungary, 516; enters Buda, 520; again, 524; before Vienna, *ib.*; his pretensions, 546; relations with Francis I., 549; again invades Hungary, 550; besieges Güns, 551; retreats, *ib.*; projects an invasion of Italy, 573; attacks the Venetians, 582; war with Ferdinand, 594; takes possession of Buda, 595; ii. 85; Hungarian war, 96; war with Emperor Ferdinand, 168; attacks the Knights of St. John, 189; expedition to Hungary, 191; death, *ib.*
Solyman II., Sultan, iii. 113; death, 114
Sombreuil, Madlle., iv. 109
Somerset, Duke of, protector, ii. 54
Sonderbund, Swiss, iv. 631
Sophia of Russia, sister of Peter, iii. 215
— Amelia of Denmark, iii. 118
Sorbonne, bigotry of the, iv. 31
Sorel, Agnes, i. 70
Soubise, ii. 530, 532
—, Prince of, iii. 409, 411, 412, 431
Soult, Marshal, in Switzerland, iv. 324; in the Abruzzi, 342; in the "Army of England," 376; German campaign, 1805, 393 sq.; Prussian campaign, 1806, 423 sq.; Russian campaign, 1807, 429 sq., in Spain, 1808, 477 sqq., 496 sq.; 1813, 540, 546; at Toulouse, *ib.*; at Waterloo, 556; minister, 603; 608, 611
Sourdis, Cardinal de, ii. 536
Sovereignty of the People, doctrine, ii. 311
Spain, early state of, i. 56; retrogression of, ii. 12; colonial settlements, 15; their effects, 16; trade of, *ib.*; short-lived prosperity of, 18; estimation of in reign of Philip II., 135; heresy in, 398; causes of decline, 402; financial system, 406; towns of, 415; first and second Treaties of Partition, iii. 169; regency, 171; state of at the Peace of Westphalia, 265; colonies, 273; accepts a Constitution from Napoleon, iv. 470; rising against the French, 472; Constitution of 1812, 565; *Estatuto Real*, 613; Carlist insurrection, *ib.*
Spalatinus, i. 388, 397
"Spanish Fury," the, ii. 262
— Succession, question of the, iii. 166
Spener, Ph. Jacob, iii. 285
Spencer, Earl, iv. 217, 218
Spinola, Ambrose, ii. 435 sqq.; 483, 496 sqq., 545, 561
Spires, Diet of, i. 515, 532, 605
Squillaci, Marquis, iii. 516
Staaps, Frederick, iv. 487
Staël, Baron de, iv. 223
—, Madame de, iv. 5, 7, 31, 85
Stahremberg, Count, iii. 105 sqq., 184 sqq.
Stair, Earl of, iii. 368 sq.
Stanhope, General, iii. 195, 198
—, Lord, iii. 298, 299, 305
—, Colonel, iv. 582
Stanislaus Leszcinski, elected King of Poland, iii. 230; flies from Warsaw, 231; crowned, 232; retires into Pomerania, 241; at Bender, 246; attempts to regain the crown, 316, 319; flight, *ib.*; deserted by France, 320; abdicates, 324
— Poniatowski, elected King of Poland, iii. 450; declares against the dissidents, 454; attempt to carry him off, 464; treaty of cession to the three Powers, 467; interview with Catherine at Kanieff, 486; subserviency to Catherine, iv. 180, 184; writes to King of Prussia, 185; treachery, 186; degraded, 191; abdicates, 196
Stanley, Sir Wm., ii. 322
States-General, Dutch, their Constitution, ii. 478; conduct in the English Revolution, iii. 18; internal disputes, *ib.*; Stadtholdership abolished, 19; war with England, 20 sq.; treaty, 21; alliances against England, 73; deprecate Louis's wrath, 88; recognise Philip of Spain, 174
— (French), at Blois, ii. 340; in 1614, 463
Stein, Von, iv. 488, 524
Steinau, Marshal, iii. 226 sqq.
Sten Stura, ii. 507 sqq.
Stenbock, Marshal, iii. 45, 48, 61, 227, 242
Stephen, Thomas, King of Bosnia, i. 91
Steyer, Armistice, iv. 340
Stockholm, treaty of, iii. 86
Stoffiet, iv. 133, 227 sq.
Stolberg, Count, iv. 201
Stolbova, Peace of, ii. 521; iii. 50
Storch, founder of the Anabaptists, i. 498
Strahan, Sir R., iv. 306
Strasburg, seized by Louis XIV., iii. 131
Strelitzes, iii. 215 sqq.
Strickland, Walter, iii. 18 sq.
Strozzi, Pietro, ii. 108, 125 sqq.
—, Philip, ii. 291
Struensee, iii. 421 sqq.
Stuart, General, iv. 412, 491
Stuart d'Aubigny, i. 214 sqq.
Stukely, Thos., ii. 287 sqq.
Suabian League, i. 201, 507, 511
Suarez, the Jesuit, his *Défense de la Foi*, ii. 396
Sublime Porte, i. 10
Suchet, Marshal, iv. 336, 497, 560
Suffren, Bailli de, iii. 535
Sully, ii. 410, 414, 422, 454, 458, 460
Sultan, prerogatives of, i. 9; title when first assumed, *ib. note.*
Suresne, Conference of, ii. 357
Surrey, Earl of, invades France, i. 422
Suspects, loi des, iv. 150
Suvarof, General, iii. 457, 485 sqq.; 496, 505; iv. 193 sqq.; 320 sqq.
Swante, Sture, ii. 507
Sweden, history of, ii. 506 sq.; Reformation introduced into, 512; the crown made hereditary, 515; treaty with France, 589; joins the Triple Alliance, iii. 78; revolution in, 120; war with Prussia, 121; revolution, 127; revolution (1719), 253; position in Europe, 268; revolution, 360; alliance with Turkey, 362; war with Russia, 363
"Swede's Stone," the, ii. 576
Switzerland, early history, i. 29 sqq.; perpetual alliance with France, 147; seizes the Valteline, Locarno, and Chiavenna, 292; Swiss infantry, 305; attacked by the French Republic, iv. 291; state of, 292
Szilagyi, i. 89

TAGLIACOZZO, John, i. 86
Tallard, Marshal, iii. 184, 185
Talleyrand, Perigord, Bishop of Autun, iii. 545; joins the *Tiers État*, iv. 46; officiates at the Federation, 71; takes the oath to the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, 72; in London, 124;

TALLIEN
adulation of Bonaparte, 286; American *douceur*, 298; ministry, 335; marriage, 360; Prince of Benevento, 413; prime minister of Louis XVIII., 562; superseded, 564
Tallien, iv. 108, 158, 169 sqq., 228, 239
Talon, Omer, iii. 5, 147 sq.
Tanucci, Marquis, iv. 205 sq.
Targowitz, Confederation of, iv. 185 sqq.
Tarnogrod, Confederation, iii. 218
Tavannes, Marshal, ii. 181 sqq.; 208
Tavora, Marquis, iii. 436
Tauroggen, Capitulation of, iv. 524
Tchendereli, i. 6
Tekeli, Emmerich, iii. 108 sqq.
Temesvar, conquered by the Turks, ii. 97
Temple, Sir William, iii. 78
Tencin, Cardinal, iii. 372, 415
Terouenne, destruction of, ii. 102
Terrai, Abbé, iii. 519, 521
Terreur Blanche, the, iv. 213
Terzka, Count, ii. 579 sqq.
Teschen, Peace of, iii. 474
Tessé, Marshal, iii. 189 sq.
Tessino, seized by the Swiss, i. 229
Tetzel, John, i. 385 sqq.
Teutonic Order, i. 21, 511; iii. 178
Thamas Kouli Khan, iii. 330; iv. 196
Theatines, founded, ii. 9
Thebes, a duchy, i. 78
Théot, Catherine, iv. 172
Thessalonica, conquered by the Turks, i. 15
Theuerdank, i. 374
Thiers, M., during the Ordinances of July, 1830; iv. 588; minister for foreign affairs, and President of the Council, 605; prime minister, 608 sq.; dismissed, 611; during Revolution of 1848, 622; supports Louis Napoleon, 648; arrested, 650
Thirty Years' War, its horrors, ii. 596
Thomas, Greek despot, i. 76; flies to Rome, 77
— of Gaëta, i. 334
Thomas of Savoy, Prince of Carignano, ii. 613, 627
Thou, De, ii. 366
Thugut, Baron, iii. 473; account of, iv. 203; policy, 204, 214 sq., 235, 258 sqq., 297, 308, 320, 338, 362
Thuriot, iv. 49, 149, 174
Thurn, Count, ii. 480 sqq.
Tichelaar, iii. 91 sq.
Tiers Etat, iv. 4 sq., 35
Tilly, Count, ii. 495, 500 sqq., 546 sqq.
Tilsit, Peace of, iv. 432; secret articles, 434
Timarli, what, i. 4
Tippoo Saib, iii. 539
Tithes, French, abolished, iv. 67
Tocqueville, M., iv. 33, 39
Toison d'or, Order, i. 137
Toledo, Peace of, i. 576
—, Don Pedro de, ii. 64
Tolentino, Peace of, iv. 260
Tomory, Archbishop, i. 519 sq.
Töplitz, treaty of, iv. 533
Tordesillas, treaty of, i. 321
Torgau, league of, i. 514
Tormassof, General, iv. 514 sqq.
Torquato Conti, ii. 563
Torquemada, Grand Inquisitor, i. 192
Torres Vedras, iv. 498

TORRINGTON
Torrington, Earl of, iii. 152
Torstenson, General, ii. 572, 610 sqq.
Toulon, occupation of, iv. 156
Tournon, Cardinal, i. 571, 614; ii. 55
Tours, Council of, i. 276
Tourville, Admiral, iii. 156, 158
Toussaint l'Ouverture, iv. 361
Transubstantiation, when established, i. 325
Trastamare, House of, i. 56, 185
Travendahl, Peace of, iii. 223
Traun, Marshal, iii. 373 sq.
Trautmannsdorf, Count, iii. 483, 498 sq.
Treaties, ancient, how promulgated, i. 308
Treilhard, iv. 283, 290, 297, 307, 315, 322
Trent, Council of, opened, i. 618; ii. 61; discussion on the episcopal office, 62; transferred to Bologna, 64; reassembled at Trent, 85; flight of, 91; reassembled, 171; Cardinal of Lorraine appears at, 172; reforms of, 172; close of, 173; effects of, 392
Tribunal, French extraordinary criminal, iv. 105; Revolutionary, 133; reformed, 149
Trivulzio, Antonio, i. 614
—, Marshal, i. 279, 280, 414
Troja, iv. 639
Trolle, Gustavus, Archbishop, ii. 508 sqq.
Tromp, Admiral, iii. 20, 21, 124
Troyes, treaty of, i. 63
Trubetskoi, Marshal, iii. 446, *note*
—, Prince, iv. 582
Truchsen, Gebhard, Elector of Cologne, ii. 379
—, George, i. 503, 508
Tübingen, treaty of, i. 380
Tugendbund, the, iv. 488
Tughra, what, i. 9
Tunis, taken by Charles V., i. 561
Turenne, ii. 626, 628, 634; part in the *Fronde*, iii. 7; defeated by Mazarine, 10; reconciles himself with Anne of Austria, 11; opposes Condé at Paris, 13; raises the siege of Arras, 17; defeats Condé at Dunkirk, 25; further victories, 26; commands in the Netherlands, 93; victories on the Rhine, 97; ravages the Palatinate, *ib.*; killed, 98
Turgot, iii. 521; iv. 14, 31
Turkey Company, ii. 382
Turkish army, i. 4
— Empire, incipient decline, ii. 388; extent of under Achmet I., *ib.*; maritime force, 423; condition of, iv. 579 sqq.
Turkmans, i. 2
Tuscany, Grand-Duchy of, erected, ii. 121
Tycho Brahe, ii. 445 *note*, 517
Tyrcowicz, Confederacy of, iii. 48
Tyrolese, rising of the, iv. 481, 487

UKRAINE, the, iii. 41
Ulema, what, i. 13
Ulm, treaty of, ii. 494
Ulrica Eleanora, Queen of Sweden, iii. 253; treaty with Augustus II., *ib.*; transfers the crown to her husband, 254; death, 365
—, Queen of Sweden, iii. 405
Ulrich, Duke of Würtemberg, i. 379 sq., 507, 569

VENETIANS
Unigenitus, Bull, iii. 210, 289, 407
"Union of Brussels," ii. 298 sqq.; of Utrecht, 305
—, Council of the (French League), ii. 343
— of England and Scotland, iii. 194
United Netherlands, peace with Spain, ii. 629, 632
Urban VII., Pope, ii. 352
— VIII., Pope, founds the Propaganda College, ii. 402; election, 528; negociations with France, 535; disallows Richelieu's nomination as Coadjutor of Trèves, 590; exertions in favour of Austria, 622; death, 627
Urbino, Duke of, nephew of Julius II., assassinates the Cardinal of Pavia, i. 281
Ursins, Des, Princess, iii. 175, 206, 293 sqq.
Utraquists, i. 330
Utrecht, Peace of, iii. 207
Uzeda, Duke d', ii. 476

VALDEZ, General, iv. 602, 614
Valencia, united to Aragon, i. 60
Valenzuela, Don Fernando de, iii. 87, 165
Valetta, founded, ii. 190
Valla, Laurentius, i. 338
Valois, House of, extinguished, ii. 345
—, Margaret of, Duchess of Alençon, i. 460; visits Madrid, *ib.*; marries Henry II. of Navarre, 471
Vandamme, General, iv. 481
Van der Noot, iii. 493 sqq.
Van der Werf, Adrian, ii. 260
Vane, Sir Henry, iii. 19
Vanozza, concubine of Pope Alexander VI., i. 178
Vargas, Alphonso, ii. 333
—, Juan de, ii. 244
Varlet, iv. 139, 144
Vasa, Gustavus, rises against Christian II., ii. 510; in Dalecarlia, *ib.*; besieges Stockholm, 511; regent of Sweden, *ib.*; King of Norway. (*See* Gustavus I.)
Vasco de Gama, i. 313
Vassy, massacre of, ii. 157
Vasvar, Peace of, iii. 106
Vauban, iii. 89, 95, 131, 184
Vaucelles, truce of, ii. 116
Vaudois, persecutions of the, i. 613; ii. 147; iii. 23, 140
Vehm-gericht, i. 25
Velasco, Spanish constable, i. 583; ii. 363
Velez, Marquis de los, ii. 606 sq.
Venables, Admiral, iii. 23
Vendôme, Anthony, Duke of, ii. 59; marries Jeanne d'Albret, *ib.*
—, Duke of (reign of Louis XIV.), iii. 181 sqq., 191 sqq.
Venetians, at Constantinople, i. 14; early history, 42 sqq.; Greek Islands held by, 79; treaty with the Turks, 81; war with Turks, territory ravaged, 97; disputes with Pope Sixtus IV., 175; league against them, 244; attacked by Bajazet, ii. 245; release their subjects from allegiance, 268; reconciled with Julius II., 270; Papal power among, 334; decline of their city, 366; place themselves under the protection of France, 583; commerce,

ii. 19 sq.; revolution, 348; restrictive system, 402; disputes with Pope Paul V., 442; plot against, 477; peace with the Porte, iii. 107; another war, 110; success in the Morea, 112, 115; war with Turks (1715), 301; decline of, iv. 207; incur the enmity of France, 208; dismiss Louis XVIII., 238; abandon Verona to the French, 245; demonstrations against the French, 265; accept Bonaparte's terms, 267; extinction of the republic, 269; republic restored, 637; reduced by the Austrians, 646
Vêpres Véronèses, iv. 265
Vercelli, treaty of, i. 216
Verdun besieged, iv. 108; *détenus* at, 373
Verdungus, Peter, ii. 487
Vere, Sir Francis, ii. 323, 434 sq.
—, Sir Horace, ii. 502
Vergennes, Count, iii. 458, 521 sqq., 538 sqq.
Vergniaud, iv. 84 sqq., 102 sqq., 121, 141 sqq.
Vernon, Admiral, iii. 338
"Very Christian King," title, i. 159
Versailles, Peace of, iii. 539; banquet at, iv. 60; palace stormed, 62
Vervins, Peace of, ii. 374
Veto, Liberum, in Poland, iii. 40
—, in France, iv. 58
Vic, treaty of, ii. 568
Vicars of the Empire, i. 24
Victor Amadeus of Savoy, ii. 561
— — II. of Savoy, iii. 132; persecutes the Vaudois, 140; joins the Grand Alliance, 155; invades Dauphiné, 157; collusion with France, 161; marries his daughter to Philip V. of Spain, 175; accedes to Grand Alliance, 184; enters Milan, 192; peace with France, 205; King of Sicily, 206; of Sardinia, 306; abdicates, 320
— — III., death, iv. 242
— Emanuel I., iv. 368; restored, 551; abdicates, 575
— — II., iv. 643; reduces Genoa, 645; joins the alliance against Russia, 661
—, Marshal, iv. 321, 376, 496, 520
Victoria, Queen, iv. 628; visits Paris, 662
Vienna, besieged by Solyman I., i. 524; by Mahomet IV., iii. 108; alliance of, 312; second treaty of, 314; third treaty of, 324; Congress, iv. 551; treaty of, 552
Vieux Cordelier, journal, iv. 165
Viglius, ii. 225 sq., 231
Villadarias, Marquis, iii. 182, 189
Villaflor, Count, iv. 615
Villarias, Marquis, iii. 423
Villars, Marshal, iii. 183 sqq., 192 sqq., 203 sqq., 322
Villèle, M., iv. 565, 759
Villemain, Monsieur, iv. 16, 40
Villena, Marquis of, i. 462
Villeneuve, Admiral, iv. 392 sq.
Villeroi, Marshal, iii. 160 sq., 178 sqq., 192
Vincenzio di Gonzaga, ii. 559
Visconti, House of, i. 48 sq.
Vitry, Cardinal, i. 311
Vizier, what, i. 9
—, Grand, functions of, i. 9 sq.; titles, revenue, &c., 10; of the cupola or bench, *ib.*
Voltaire, iii. 459, 510; iv. 14, 17 sqq.
Vor-Parlament, German, iv. 631 sqq.
Vorstius, ii. 478
Vossem, treaty of, iii. 94

WAGER, Admiral, iii. 333
Wake, Sir Isaac, ii. 505, 620
Walcheren, expedition to, iv. 489
Waldeck, Prince of, ii. 154 sq.
Wall, Don Ricardo, iii. 424 sqq.
Wallachia, hospodars of, i. 91
Wallenstein, Albert von, ii. 487; becomes Duke of Friedland, 548; raises an army, 549; penetrates into Jutland, 551; makes proposals to Gustavus Adolphus, 552; appointed "General of the Ocean and the Baltic," 552; besieges Stralsund, 553; progress in North Germany, 558; dismissed, *ib.*; resumes the command, 569; his exorbitant demands, 570; interview with Maximilian of Bavaria, 571; camp at Alte Berg, *ib.*; negociations with Gustavus Adolphus, 572; proceeds to Saxony, *ib.*; retreats into Bohemia, 576; called *Il Tiranno*, *ib.*; truce with the Saxons, 578; negociations with Feuquières, *ib.*; his resignation prevented, 579; offers to lay down his command, 580; communicates with Duke Bernhard, 581; assassinated, 583
Wallis, Count, iii. 333
Walloons, ii. 221; treaty with Farnese, 306
Walmoden, General, iv. 219 sq., 374
Walpole, Sir Robert, iii. 336 sqq., 367 sq.
Warsaw, Peace of iii. 232, 248; Grand Duchy of, iv. 432
Wartburg, Luther at the, i. 497; mummeries at the, iv. 579
Wartensleben, General, iv. 251
Warwick, Earl of, i. 119, 132; negociations with Louis XI., 132; his conduct examined, 133; flies to France, 134; dethrones Edward IV., 135; death, 136
Washington, George, iii. 523 sqq.
Wawrzecki, iv. 194 sqq.
Wedell, General, iii. 420
Weishaupt, Adam, iv. 202
Weiss Kunig, the, i. 374
Welau, treaty of, iii. 55
Welker, iv. 630
Welles, Sir Robert, his insurrection, i. 134
Wellesley, Sir A. (*See* Wellington.)
Wellington (Duke of), at Copenhagen, iv. 439; in Portugal, 474 sqq., 496 sqq.; at Talavera, 497; lines of Torres Vedras, 498; at Salamanca, 500; Spanish generalissimo, 501; campaign of 1813, 530 sq.; campaign of 1814, 546; at Vienna, 551; in Belgium, 555 sq.; at St. Petersburg, 583
Wendelin, ii. 21
Wenzel won Budowa, ii. 447
Werben, treaty of, ii. 565
Werela, Peace of, iii. 496
Werth, John von, ii. 577 sqq., 593 sqq., 616 sqq.
Westermann, General, iv. 156, 167
Westminster, treaty of (1527), i. 486; (1674), iii. 96; (1742), 358
Westphalia, Peace of, ii. 635 sqq.; character of that epoch, iii. 256
—, kingdom of, iv. 450; increased with Hanover, 495
Wettin, House of, i. 22
Weyer, Van de, iv. 595
Whitworth, Lord, iv. 347, 370 sq.
Wiclif, i. 328; his doctrines in Bohemia, 329
Wicliffites, i. 327
Wieland, iv. 202
William the Silent, ii. 114, 224; scene with Philip II., 225; parentage and education, 228; why called the "Silent," 229; motives of discontent, 233; change of religion, 239; his life threatened, 240; refuses to swear obedience, *ib.*; retires to Dillenburg, *ib.*; his son seized, 245; collects an army, 246; his "Justification," 247; unfortunate campaign, *ib.*; takes several towns, 253; retreats, *ib.*; Stadtholder, 255; turns Calvinist, 257; marries Charlotte de Bourbon, 262; rejects the Perpetual Edict, 299; enters Brussels, 300; elected *Ruward*, *ib.*; restores order in Ghent, 307; proscribed, *ib.*; his *Apologie*, 308; Sovereign Count of Holland and Zealand, 311, 316; wounded by an assassin, 313; assassinated, 317; his family, *ib.*; character, *ib.*
— II., Dutch Stadtholder, proposes to restore the Stuarts, iii. 17, 18; disputes with Holland, *ib.*; death, 19
— Henry of Orange, birth, iii. 19. (*See* William III.)
— III. of Orange, King of England, "Child of the State," iii. 72; opposed by De Witt, 87; Stadtholder, 91; sanctions the murder of the De Witts, 92; answer to Charles II.'s ambassadors, 93; campaign, 1673, 94; proclaimed Hereditary Stadtholder, 96; marries Princess Mary, 100; attacks the Duke of Luxembourg, 102; unsuccessful efforts against Louis, 135; hatred of that monarch, 142; anti-French policy, 143; organises the League of Augsburg, 144; prepares a descent on England, 149; favoured by Spain, 151; invades England, *ib.*; becomes King, *ib.*; declares war against France, 152; in the Netherlands, 156; attacks Luxembourg at Steinkirk, 157; defeated at Neerwinden, 159; takes Namur, 161; concludes the Peace of Ryswick, 162; recognised by Louis XIV., 163; treaties for partition of Spain, 169; recognises Philip V., 174; prepares for war, 179; death, *ib.*; makes England a European Power, 266
— IV. of Nassau-Dietz, Stadtholder, iii. 388; death, 478
— V., Stadtholder, iii. 478; signs Act of Consultation, 479; deposed as Captain General, 480; restored by Prussia, 481
— I., King of the Netherlands, iv. 538, 548; unpopular government, 595
— IV. of England, iv. 593; death, 628
— IV., Landgrave of Hesse, ii. 564
— V. of Hesse, ii. 594
— II., Elector of Hesse, abdicates, iv. 602
—, Duke of Bavaria, ii. 378, 394
—, — — Clèves, i. 582, 602
Williams, General, iv. 662
Willot, General, iv. 271 sqq.
Willoughby, Lord, ii. 324

WILLOUGHBY
Willoughby, Sir Hugh, ii. 418
Wilson, Sir R., iv. 570
Wimpfen, Felix, iv. 143
Wimpina, i. 387
Windischgrätz, Prince, iv. 138, 642 sq.
Winwood, Sir Ralph, ii. 438
Winzingerode, iv. 529
Witchcraft, i. 340
Witt, John De, Grand Pensionary, iii. 21; foments disturbances in England, 72; compromising policy, 77; opposes William III., 87; attempt to assassinate, 91; massacred, 92
—, Cornelius De, iii. 20, 91 sq.
Wittelsbach, House of, i. 22
Wittenberg, University, founded, i. 382
—, Capitulation of, ii. 47
—, Field-marshal, iii. 44 sqq.
Wittgenstein, General, iv. 514 sqq., 529
Wladislaus of Poland, elected King of Hungary, i. 17; leads an expedition against the Turks, *ib.*; death, 18, 32
—, elected King of Bohemia, i. 195; cedes Lusatia, Moravia, and Silesia to Matthias, 197; elected King of Hungary, 199; death, 370
— III. of Poland, i. 15
— IV. of Poland, ii. 593
Wolfe, General, iii. 283, 427
Wolfgang of Neuberg, ii. 481 sqq.
Wolf Tone, iv. 305
Wolsey, i. 348; made Cardinal, 359, 360; courted by Francis I., 373; by Charles V., 378; arbitrator at Calais, 411; visits the Emperor, 412; his treachery, 414; misses the Papacy, 439; appointed legate *a latere*, *ib.*; goes over to Francis I., 453; artful policy, 470, 472; conduct after sack of Rome, 486; embassy to France, *ib.*; clandestine declaration of war, 493
Women, influence of, in France, i. 351. 415
Woodville, Sir John, executed, i. 133
Worms, Diet of, i. 379 sq.; Edict of, 400; disputation of, 589; Diet of (1545), 612; treaty of, iii. 371
Wrangel, Charles Gustavus, ii. 619 sqq.; iii. 44, 55 sqq., 122
—, General, iv. 634, 642
Wrede, General, iv. 536
Wullenwever, George, ii. 514
Wurmser, General, iv. 161 sqq.; 231 sq.; 248 sqq.
Würtemberg, duchy, founded, i. 423, 379 sqq.; Prince of, iii. 232 sqq.; a kingdom, iv. 407
Wyat, Sir Thomas, ii. 105

XAVIER, missionary labours, ii. 285, 401
Ximenes, Cardinal, i. 247, 252; becomes Cardinal and Inquisitor-General, 255; expedition to Oran, 282; proceedings on the death of Ferdinand, 364; dismissed by Charles, 367; death, *ib.*

YARMOUTH, Lord, iv. 420
Year, commencement of, altered in France, ii. 175, *note*.
York, Roland, ii. 322
—, Duke of, iv. 145, 160 sq.; 215 sqq.; 326
—, General, iv. 524
Ypsilanti, Alexander, iv. 581
Ysambeau, iv. 158
Yusuf Pasha, iv. 503

ZAMOLSKY, Polish chancellor, ii. 380
Zapolya, John, King of Hungary, i. 546, 593; death, 594
—, John, Count of Zips, i. 370 sq.
—, —, voyvode of Transylvania, candidate for the crown of Hungary, i. 522; crowned at Alba Regia, 522; defeated at Tokay, 523; re-established, 524
Zastrow, General, iv. 427 sq.
Zea Bermudez, iv. 571, 613
Zieten, General, iv. 555
Zill'ullah, title of the Sultan, i. 3
Zinzendorf, Count, iii. 286
Ziska, i. 33; sepulchre of, destroyed, ii. 498
Zizim, son of Mahomet II., i. 208 sq.; death, 210
Znaim, armistice of, iv. 485
Zollverein, German, iv. 601
Zouboff, Valerian, iv. 197
Zriny, Count, ii. 191; iii. 104, 108
Zucchi, General, iv. 606
Zumalacarregui, iv. 613 sqq.
Zutphen, Henry von, i. 506
—; siege of, ii. 322
Zwickau prophets, i. 498
Zwingli, i. 400; his doctrines bolder than Luther's, 402, 535; proposals to Francis I., 544; death, *ib.*

THE END.

ERRATA.

VOL. I.

Page	210,	line	25	*for*	1494	*read*	1495.
„	221	„	32	„	Francesco	„	Giovanni.
„	408	„	15	„	Louis	„	Louisa.
„	446	heading		„	Marignano	„	Pavia.

VOL. II.

TABLE OF SOVEREIGNS, page 2, *for* Sixtus V. 1592, *read* Sixtus V. 1590.
And after this Pontiff insert—
Urban VII. 1590. Gregory XIV. 1591. Innocent IX. 1592.

Page	72,	line	16,	*for*	That	*read*	This.
„	271	„	8	„	Wold	„	Wola.
„	307	„	37	„	1759	„	1579.
„	320	„	25	„	rescue	„	rescued.
„	388	„	15	„	1506	„	1606.

VOL. III.

Page	106,	line	12,	*for*	Eleanora	*read*	Mary Anne.
„	297	„	15	„	1615	„	1715.
„	328	heading		„	Catherine II.	„	Catherine I.
„	373	line	24	„	1749	„	1744.
„	374	heading		„	„	„	„
„	405	„	21	„	Frederic II.	„	Frederick I.
„	469	„	26	„	Kaiwardschi	„	Kainardji.

VOL. IV.

Page	109,	line	29,	*for*	Marséilles	*read*	Versailles.
„	198	„	19	„	Frederick VII.	„	Frederick VI.
„	227	„	34	„	Penthière	„	Penthièvre.
„	231	„	34	„	Réveillère	„	La Réveillère.
„	419	„	91	„	Germany	„	German.
„	451	„	13	„	appear	„	appears
„	453	„	17	„	1808	„	1807.
„	466	„	29	„	for	„	from.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.

NEW-STREET SQUARE

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018